AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

THIRD SERIES—VOL. III.—(XXIII).—NOVEMBER, 1900.—NO. 5.

THE SACRIFICIAL IDEA IN THE MASS.

IT is of faith, as defined by the Council of Trent,[1] that in the holy Mass there is offered a true sacrifice. It is also of faith that the sacrifice of the New Law is one. "Nor yet," says the Apostle, speaking of our High Priest, "that He should offer Himself often; . . . but now once at the end of ages He hath appeared for the taking away of sin by the sacrifice of Himself."[2] And again, in the same Epistle:[3] "For by one oblation He hath perfected forever them that are sanctified." The sacrifices of the Old Law, many and varied, did but shadow forth the one perfect sacrifice of the New. In this the Man-God is both Priest and Victim—"priest forever according to the order of Melchisedech;"[4] and "the Lamb that was slain from the foundation of the world."[5] True, this sacrifice is twofold in accidents and outward form; but in inner essence and substance it is one—essentially one, specifically, nay numerically, one. "We confess," are the words of the Catechism of the Council of Trent, "that the sacrifice of the Mass is one and the same sacrifice with that of the Cross." It differs from the latter, as the Council has declared, "only in the manner of offering." In other words, the difference is extrinsic, not intrinsic; accidental, not essential or substantial. It is not another sacrifice, not a new sacrifice; it has no merits of its own that are independent of the sacrifice offered up on Calvary; it adds not one iota to the value of that sacrifice; it does but

[1] Sess. XXII, can. 1.
[2] Heb. 9: 25, 26.
[3] Heb. 10: 14.
[4] Psal. 109: 4; Heb. 7: 17.
[5] Apoc. 13: 8.

apply the fruits of that sacrifice to the souls of men. Such has ever been the teaching of the Church; such the belief of Catholics in every age. "The Church is so far from believing," says the learned Bossuet on this point, "that anything is wanting to the sacrifice of the Cross that she deems it, on the contrary, so perfectly and so fully sufficient, that whatever is afterwards added has been instituted to celebrate its memory and apply its virtue. We acknowledge that all the merit of the Redemption of mankind is derived from the death of the Son of God. When, therefore, in the celebration of the divine mysteries we say, 'We offer to Thee this holy Victim,' we pretend not by this oblation to make or to present to God a new payment of the price of our salvation, but to offer to Him in our behalf the merits of Jesus Christ present, and that infinite price which He once paid for us upon the Cross."[6]

If you ask the ordinary lay Catholic how or why the Mass is a sacrifice, he will perhaps think you are trifling with him, or he will refer you for an answer to the Catechism. He has been taught from a child that *the Mass is the same sacrifice as that of the Cross.* The idea of this sameness is ever present with him while he assists at Mass, and traces, in his mind or on the pictured page before him, the several stages of his Saviour's Passion. He would probably be astonished to learn that any one could have a difficulty in understanding how the Mass is a sacrifice. And yet, if you take up any of our modern text-books of Dogmatic Theology, you will find that this point, which is so plain to the

[6] *Exposit. de la Doctrine Cathol.*, sect. XIV. In Lehmkuhl (*Theol. Mor.*, Vol. 2, p. 122, ed. 1888) I read: "Suarez aliique theologi communius asserunt, idque recte, potius dici *simpliciter* diversa sacrificia [cruentum videlicet et incruentum], quam unum idemque, at unum idemque dici debere *secundum quid.*" This notwithstanding, the received teaching is that the sacrifice of the Mass is one and the same sacrifice with that of the Cross, not in a qualified sense, but without qualification. The Catechism of the Council of Trent says, "one and the same," without addition or qualification of any sort, and *sine additio dici est idem ac dici simpliciter.* The Fathers of Trent say (Sess. XXII, c. 1): "Haec [Eucharistica oblatio] illa est, quae (Gen. 4 et 22; Lev. 1, 2 et 8, et alibi) per varias sacrificiorum, naturae et legis tempore, similitudines figurabatur; utpote quae bona omnia, per illa significata, velut illorum omnium consummatio et perfectio complectitur." Observe that all the typical sacrifices of the Old Law, the bloody not less than the unbloody (it is the former alone that are spoken of in the texts to which references are given), are here declared to be fulfilled in the Eucharistic Sacrifice. We find the same thing

ordinary lay intelligence, is, to the theologian, full of doubt and perplexity. Hurter[7] cites as many as five different theories upon it.

It is well that we should have a clear idea of the precise point on which there exists this divergence of theological opinion. The question which modern theologians have set themselves to answer is this: "In quonam est reponenda formalis ratio sacrificii Missae?" What is the sacrificial idea in the Mass? Or to put it another way, What is it that makes the Mass a sacrifice? Or, once more, What is the formal and intrinsic reason why the Mass is a sacrifice? The question is not wherein lies the essence of the Eucharistic Sacrifice; for all, or nearly all, are agreed that this lies in the consecration. The real question is, assuming that the essence of the sacrifice consists in the consecration, how the consecration makes the Mass a sacrifice, or what is it that gives the consecration its sacrificial character.

I have said advisedly that it is modern theologians who are divided in opinion on this point. It does not seem to have occurred to the Fathers of the Church, or to the Doctors of the Middle Age, that the matter was one which could admit of difficulty. In the *Summa* of St. Thomas, where so many subtle questions are discussed, and so many difficulties solved, this point is not once mooted. Those men of old, it would appear, believing with an intensely practical faith that the Mass was the self-same sacrifice once offered upon the Cross, saw in this, as the simple faithful see in it to-day, the all-sufficient reason why the

affirmed by St. Augustine over and over again. Thus (*De Civitate Dei*, lib. 20, c. 23, n. 5) he says: "Cessaturas enim victimas, quas in umbra futuri offerebant Judaei, et unum sacrificium gentes a solis ortu usque ad occasum, sicut jam fieri cernimus, oblaturas, per Prophetas Hebraeos oracula increpuere divina." (*Cf.* also *ibid.*, lib. 10, c. 20; *Enarratio in Psal.* 39, n. 14). How the sacrifice offered by Abel (Gen. 4), and the sacrifice of the calf immolated by the sons of Aaron (Lev. 1 : 5), and the other bloody sacrifices of the Old Law can be said to have prefigured or shadowed forth the Eucharistic Sacrifice, if this is to be regarded as a "sacrificium *simpliciter diversum*" from that of the Cross, is a problem which demands solution at the hands of those who deny the formal identity of the sacrifice of the Mass with the sacrifice offered up on Calvary. There could surely be no stronger proof of their identity, *etiam in ratione sacrificii*, than the fact that the figure which *primo et per se* foreshadows the one is said, simply and without qualification, to foreshadow the other as well.

[7] *Compendium Theologiae Dogmaticae*, Vol. 3, pp. 386–9.

Mass is a sacrifice. Thus, St. John Chrysostom, in his commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews, after explaining why it was needful for the Jews to repeat their oblations day after day, goes on to observe:

"But in the case of Christ it is different; He was offered once, and it was enough for all time. . . . What? Do not we, too, offer up (sacrifices) daily? We do indeed, but making a commemoration of His death; and this is one, not many. . . . We always offer up the same; not one sheep to-day, and to-morrow another, but always the same. Are there, then, many Christs, since He is offered up in many places? Not so; but one Christ everywhere, who is here entire, and there entire—one body. As, then, He that is offered up in many places is one body, not many bodies, so the sacrifice is one. Our High Priest it is who offered up that sacrifice which cleanses us. That same sacrifice do we offer up also now which was then offered up—that sacrifice which cannot be consumed. This takes place for a commemoration of that which then took place. For *This do ye*, He saith, *in remembrance of me.*"

In every sacrifice, strictly so-called, we distinguish three things: (1) priest; (2) victim; (3) the offering and immolation of the victim. The two first may be called the material elements, the last the formal element, of the sacrifice. It is plain that priest and victim *in actu primo* (to borrow a phrase from the schoolmen) are but the agent and matter of the sacrifice. The priest is not a priest *in actu secundo;* nor is the victim a victim *in actu secundo*, until the latter is offered and immolated by the former. Hence the formal element of the sacrifice, the *ratio formalis sacrificii*, consists in this offering and immolation—the offering and immolation in an active sense on the part of the priest, in a passive sense on the part of the victim. As for the immolation, it is true that it need not necessarily involve the physical destruction of the victim in every case. But in the case of a living victim, real immolation involves the real death, that is, the taking away of the life of the victim. So the Scriptures clearly imply; so we gather even from the common consent of mankind. At any rate, the immolation of the living Victim offered up on Calvary involved the death of that Victim. And the sacrificial idea in that sacrifice, the formal reason why that oblation was a real sacrifice, lay, be-

yond all doubt, in the fact that Christ there offered Himself to the Father for the sins of men, and immolated Himself even to the shedding of the last drop of His blood and the physical separation of soul and body upon the altar of the Cross.

And now we are getting near the heart of our inquiry—What is the sacrificial idea in the Mass? Is the formal reason why the Mass is a sacrifice one and the same with the formal reason why the oblation of the Divine Victim on Calvary was a sacrifice? Yes, says Christian instinct, guided by simple faith; for the sacrifice of the Mass is one and the same with the sacrifice of the Cross. No, say modern theologians; but they do not agree in their explanation of what it is that makes the Mass a sacrifice. Differing as they do, they cannot all be right; and it is quite within the bounds of possibility that all of them may be wrong.

Of the several theories put forward on this point, only two have met with wide acceptance. One is that of Cardinal Franzlin, first formulated by Cardinal de Lugo. According to this view, the reason why the Mass is a sacrifice is that our Blessed Lord in the Eucharist assumes a *status declivior*—puts Himself in a state of death, as it were, stripping Himself of the natural use of every sensible faculty, and taking the form of meat and drink to be consumed by men. This, it is said, is equivalent to the immolation of Himself, and quite sufficient to make the Mass a sacrifice. The other theory, first propounded by Lessius, is perhaps the one more commonly received. In this view, that which formally constitutes the Mass a sacrifice is the mystic immolation of the august Victim that has place in the separate consecration of the bread and wine, the effect of which is to represent our Lord as slain upon the altar.

The former of these theories is, it seems to me, open to at least two serious objections. The species of moral immolation, which it substitutes for the physical immolation, is not enough to constitute a sacrifice in the strict sense of the word. Else the Incarnation was a sacrifice, because, in becoming incarnate, the Son of God "emptied Himself," as the Apostle forcibly words it, "taking the form of a servant." And there is the still graver objection that, in this view, the Mass would be a sacrifice independently of the piercing of Christ's body and the shedding of His blood upon

the Cross. Even if our Lord had never suffered death, He might have given His body and blood as meat and drink under the appearances of bread and wine, and so, according to this theory, be offered in sacrifice. Thus the Mass would have sacrificial fruits of its own, instead of merely applying to the faithful the fruits of the sacrifice offered up on Calvary—which tallies not well with the teaching of the Tridentine Fathers.

Nor is the other theory without its inconveniences. It is exceedingly difficult to see how a mystic immolation is going to give us a real sacrifice, such as the Mass undoubtedly is. Of course there is in the Mass a mystic immolation. But is it this, after all, that makes it to be what it is, the great Sacrifice of the New Law, an oblation of infinite dignity and worth, a propitiatory offering for the sins of the quick and the dead? A mystic immolation supposes a real immolation, apart from which and independently of which it has no real value whatever. It is not, therefore, the mystic immolation that gives the Mass its sacrificial efficacy and value —which amounts to the same thing as to say that it is not the mystic immolation that makes the Mass a real sacrifice. Certainly that which gives the Mass all its sacrificial value is also that which makes it a real sacrifice; and that is the real immolation of Christ upon the Cross, which was made but once—*semel oblatus est*,—but is of infinite worth and perennial value; so that it works not the less efficaciously for the remission of sins in the Mass, where the same victim is offered by the same High Priest "from the rising of the sun to the going down of the same," than it did on that first Good Friday when it wrought the conversion and won the pardon of the penitent thief.

To sum up the argument. The immolation of a victim enters into the essential concept of sacrifice and is an essential element of it; the Mass is, in all its essential elements, one and the same with the sacrifice of the Cross; it was no mystic or moral immolation that made this a sacrifice; neither, then, is it a mystic or moral immolation that makes the Mass a sacrifice. Again, the Mass, as is defined by the Council of Trent, is a propitiatory sacrifice; propitiation was made and the price paid for sin once for all on Calvary; it was by no mystic or moral immolation that Christ paid the price, "blotting out the handwriting of the decree that was

against us, fastening it to the Cross;" therefore, it is no mystic or moral immolation of Christ which makes the Mass a sacrifice. Once more: so far forth as the Mass differs from the sacrifice of the Cross, it has no sacrificial value; for the Council of Trent teaches[8] that the Mass is not derogatory to the sacrifice offered on Calvary, because, not being a new sacrifice, it does but apply the fruits of Christ's Passion to the souls of men. Now the Mass differs from the sacrifice offered on Calvary precisely inasmuch as in it there is a mystic and, if you wish, a moral immolation of the Victim. Therefore it is the physical immolation, which was made once for all on Calvary, that gives the Mass its sacrificial value and makes it a real sacrifice.

That this was the mind of St. Thomas of Aquin, although he does not deal directly with the question, is, I think, quite plain from what he has in the *Summa*.[9] He there inquires whether Christ is immolated in the Eucharist, and answers that He is, in a twofold sense. First, he explains, Christ is immolated mystically, inasmuch as the Eucharist is a symbolic representation of our Saviour's Passion, which, he says, was His real immolation. Secondly, Christ is immolated in the Eucharist in that we are made partakers of the fruits of His Passion through the Eucharist. "So far as regards the former mode" (of immolation), continues the saint, "Christ may be said to have been immolated also in the sacrifices of the Old Law. Hence in Apocal. 13, we read: 'Whose names are not written in the book of life of the Lamb that was slain from the foundation of the world.' But it is distinctive of this sacrifice," he concludes, "that in the celebration of it Christ is immolated in the second way." According to St. Thomas, therefore, the mystic immolation which has place in the Mass does not differentiate it from the sacrifices of the Old Law. It is the real immolation which makes the Mass a distinctive sacrifice; and yet it has place only in this sense, that the fruits of it are applied to us through the Mass. Therefore, according to St. Thomas, it is the real immolation of Christ upon the Cross, perennial in its efficacy, which makes the Mass the distinctive Sacrifice of the New Law. Or, to put it otherwise: *some* immolation of the Victim it is that makes the Mass a proper and distinctive sacrifice—not the mystic immolation, therefore, the real. But the real immolation took

[8] Sess. xxii, c. 2. [9] 3ª, quaest. 83, a. 1.

place only on Calvary. Therefore it is the immolation of Christ upon the Cross, together with the fact that the same Victim is really present upon the altar offered by the same High Priest, which makes the Mass the distinctive and never-failing sacrifice of the New Testament.

The Mass is at once a mystic and real sacrifice, the mystic oblation, however, being but the symbolic expression and outward manifestation of the real. It not only represents the sacrifice of the Cross, but renews and is that same sacrifice. Those who assign the mystic immolation as the *ratio formalis sacrificii* in the Mass seem to forget that they have to account, not merely for its being a sacrifice (which it would be in some sense even if there were only the immolation), but for its being a real sacrifice, identical with that which was offered on the altar of the Cross. The external rite in the celebration of the Eucharist, including the mystic immolation as the essential part of it, is spoken of by Melchior Canus[10] as the external and sensible sacrifice. But this external sacrifice is only "the image and representation of the sacrifice of the Cross; in the Body and Blood of Christ, which are contained within, that same sacrifice exists in its reality—*ejusdem sacrificii existit veritas.*"[11] This idea the author evolves in a luminous passage, of which the following is a rough translation:

"But let us concede the point to those who argue that there can be no perfect immolation unless the victim is slain; for we, too, believe this to be essential if there is to be a true sacrifice. Now (they will urge) we offer a living and breathing Victim, for the Body in the Eucharist is one and the same with that which is in Heaven. Granted; but though Christ's Body in the Eucharist has life in it, and though the Blood is in the Body, it is not offered as having life in it, nor is the Blood offered as in the Body. The Body is offered as slain, and the Blood as shed upon the Cross. If the Victim of Calvary had never been withdrawn from the sight of men, but were to hang on the Cross before the eyes of all the faithful in every place and time, there would, of course, have been no need of Christ's leaving the memorial of His death, and of transferring the reality of the living original to a representation of it (nihil necesse erat ut exemplum facti relinqueret, et in simulacrum ex animali exemplo veritas

[10] *De Locorum Usu in Scholast. Disp.*, lib. xii, c. 12.

[11] *Ibid.*, Resp. ad 2.

transferretur). Those who then stood by the Cross, if it so be that they were truly devout and understood what was going on, offered with Christ the same sacrifice to the Father. So, too, if the same Victim immolated on the Cross were to remain for all time visibly before the eyes, we should need no memorial and representation of it. But inasmuch as that offering and visible immolation, though it is done and over, is yet so acceptable to God and has such perennial worth in His eyes, that it is not less efficacious to-day than it was on the day when the Blood flowed from the Saviour's open side; therefore do we truly offer now the same sacrifice of the Cross with Christ as did those who stood beside the Cross. They indeed had no representation of the sacrifice before them, because there was no need of one so long as the bleeding Victim was there present and they could see it with the eyes. For us, on the other hand, Christ renews that sacrifice after a symbolic fashion, and sets it before us as in a sort of transcript of it. But this symbolism does not at all stand in the way of our offering the self-same Blood which Christ shed on the Cross, just as though it were now being poured forth before our eyes."[12]

This is not the explanation that you will find in the tomes of modern theologians. But it fits in exactly with the doctrine ever held by the whole Church, the doctrine which is taught in our catechisms, and preached in our pulpits, that the sacrifice of the Mass is one and the same sacrifice with that of the Cross.

ALEX. MACDONALD, D.D.

Antigonish, Nova Scotia.

[12] Some months ago I talked this point over with a friend who, by reason of his position, is entitled to speak with some degree of authority. In a letter received from him since the foregoing article was written, he puts forward a view which corresponds exactly to that of Melchior Canus, and which, because of its suggestiveness, I here subjoin in the writer's own words: "It seems to me like this. If Abraham had really sacrificed Isaac and kept his body on the altar, and if God gave Abraham a rite representing and commemorating the original sacrifice, with injunction to use that rite daily at that altar, that daily rite would then be a continuation of the original sacrifice, having the same priest, the same victim, and the same general purpose. St. John says in the Apocalypse that in Heaven he saw the Lamb as it were slain. The Victim is therefore still in the state of victim. There is no need of inventing any new humiliation as Franzlin does. To have the original sacrifice of the Cross continued, two things only are necessary: to have that Victim present on the altar, and to have a rite commemorating the original sacrifice in such manner that Christ is in each case the efficient cause of what takes place in the rite—that is the chief priest." It should be borne in mind that with the Eternal there is neither past nor future, but an everlasting present. "For a thousand years in thy sight," says the Psalmist, "are but as yesterday."

THE SUPPORT OF SICK, OLD, AND DELINQUENT CLERGYMEN.

SICKNESS, poverty, and sin are three great ills that afflict mankind. Clerics in Sacred Orders are not exempt from the universal law. To discover the best social therapeutics to cure social evils is one of the most perplexing practical problems.

My object here is not to devise and recommend a typical system of assisting priests in their temporal distress, but to analyze and comment on the existing methods. It would be preposterous to exalt any good system to the disadvantage of another. In the province of economic and social enterprise there cannot be any finalities or infallibilities, by reason of human weakness.

A discussion of the subject is at all events likely to interest many secular priests.[1] It will arouse thoughtful impulses or at least practical suggestions concerning the future economic security of their own livelihood or that of their brethren, which is necessary to their material contentment, to an increase of fellowship among them, and to the welfare of the Church.

It is hardly necessary to remind the reader in advance that the subject cannot be treated here *ex officio*, as there is no central or any other bureau of information; and the infinitesimally few who solicit or canvass reliable data, facts, figures, and other specified reports, must confront a difficult task. Some of the information obtained from the Ordinaries of dioceses are not only meagre and fragmentary, but in a measure confidential, and consequently divulged only to those whose interest warrants such disclosure. Nevertheless the object being philanthropic and eminently religious deserves a closer attention than heretofore accorded it, to stir up our latent energies, in order that the ice of callousness and indifference concerning the momentous question may not remain unbroken. On the other hand I am not unmindful that priests have not only to respect the episcopal dignity *in abstracto*, but even *in concreto*, as it is inseparably united with a particular person. Hence I hope not to be suspected of attempting to break attachment to the principle of authority in seeking to specify the limits of the priest's claims.

[1] The Regular Clergy depend for their support on the communities to which they belong.

Ecclesiastics and Rights of Support.

The Church is very solicitous in the matter of decent and lasting support of her ordained ministers. If "the workman is worthy of his meat,"[2] and "the laborer of his hire,"[3] then it is only too evident that those to whom it is allotted to serve the altar "should partake with the altar."[4] Solomon exhorts, "Honor the Lord with thy substance."[5] "The ministers of Christ, and the dispensers of God,"[6] should have the necessaries and becoming comforts of life as long as they live. The words "Let the priests who rule well be esteemed worthy of double honor, especially those who labor in the word and doctrine,"[7] seem to imply the idea of remuneration.

The Church in a sense owes her ministers in sacred orders a becoming support during their lifetime; nay, she has even taken away from them the opportunity to earn a respectable livelihood through pursuits of a secular character, such as trade or traffic, either personally or indirectly.[8] "No man being a soldier of God entangleth himself with secular business, that he may please Him to whom he hath engaged himself." This law rests partly on the same principle as that passed by the Supreme Court of the United States, making it unlawful for certain officers of the Treasury Department to engage in trade or commerce; likewise the principle which makes it unlawful for a judge to engage in the practice of law.

The maintenance of ecclesiastics is a matter of justice and not charity merely; and those who withhold them their due share may be guilty of sacrilege.[9] The ancient book of the Apostolic Canons enjoining,[10] "If any bishop or priest, when any one of the clergy is in want, do not supply his necessity, let him be suspended (*a communione rejicitur*); and if he persevere, let him be deposed, as having killed his brother,"—has some weight as an argument.

[2] Matth. 10: 10.
[3] Luke 10: 7.
[4] 1 Cor. 9: 13, 14.
[5] Prov. 3: 9.
[6] 1 Cor. 4: 1.
[7] 1 Tim. 5: 17.
[8] Const. *Apostolicae servitutis* of Benedict XIV.
[9] 2 Tim. 2: 4. Pope Gregory the Great wrote: "Sciant se sacrilegii crimen committere et aeternae damnationis periculum incurrere.
[10] Can. 58. Some authors think it apocryphal.

Source of the Support of Ecclesiastics.

The mind of the Church is that all ecclesiastics must be assured a suitable support. They are not permitted to enter the field until that question is settled. Ecclesiastical law has, therefore, required from the earliest times that before admission to higher orders the cleric shall possess a *title*, that is, an assured and guaranteed means of a sufficient and lasting maintenance. The so-called absolute ordinations, or ordinations without a title, were prohibited by the sixth canon of the Council of Chalcedon.[11] The title of ordination is the ground of an inalienable right to a "congrua perpetuaque sustentatio" of clerics in sacred orders. It indicates the source whence a becoming support must come. The above-mentioned Council decreed that a cleric must, at the time of his ordination, be designated to a definite church in a city or in a village, or to a martyr's chapel or monastery. The Council of Trent renewed the same ordinance relating to the "roving" or unattached priests ("clerici vagrantes seu acephali"), by decreeing that "no one should in future be ordained who was not attached to that church or pious institution for the needs or convenience of which he was selected, so that he might discharge his functions there, and not wander about without fixed abode."[12] The Sacred Congregation of Propaganda, April 27, 1871, issued an important instruction which refers to the title of orders in a complete and authoritative way. The title of benefice is the sole legitimate and regular title of ordination; the title of patrimony, of pension, of *mensa*, and some others are extraordinary titles requiring a dispensation from the Holy See, in which their necessity or utility to the Church must be shown.[13] There are no benefices, prebends, endowments, annuities in the nature of freeholds, no advowsons, tithes, land rents, no subsidies from the government in our country. The usual and almost universal title under which priests are ordained in this country is by virtue of special indult of the Holy See, of October 3, 1852, the extraordinary title of the mission. The reason of the "titulus missionis" in ordination is simply the lack of any other canonical title in countries where there are no benefices or foundations of one kind or another yielding a fixed

[11] 451. [12] Sess. 23, c. 16, De Reform.

[13] Devoti, *Inst. Can.*, Tom. I, sectio II, § ix, 3.

and certain income, so that a priest, once in possession of such a benefice is secure in his living. There seems to be a divergence with regard to the effect of the uncanonical *titulus missionis* from the ordinary or extraordinary canonical title. The canonical title of ordination entails as a corollary the canonical obligation of providing for ecclesiastics, even if they shall become incapable of discharging their clerical functions, whether this incapacity arise without their fault (*emeriti*) or through their own fault (*demeriti*).[14] With regard to clerics ordained under the title of the mission, who had the misfortune to side-track from the path of clerical virtue, it seems that the *titulus missionis* is a *titulus coloratus* as regards their support from the revenues of the Church.[15] P. Nilles calls the *titulus missionis* a *lex odiosa*.[16] The proper standing of an ordinand who pledges himself not to join any religious community without the permission of his ordinary and that of the S. Congregation of Propaganda, and moreover, who will devote, as long as he lives, his services to the care of souls under the guidance and jurisdiction of the ordinary for whose diocese or apostolic vicariate he is ordained, is that of a life-long volunteer, rather than that of a regular in the army of the Church Militant. On account of such service the ordinary has the correlative obligation to provide for the suitable and lasting maintenance of the co-workers under his jurisdiction in the sacred ministry.

The following quotation will explain the necessity of having a fund for the support of infirm or disabled priests. It is taken from the Constitution of the Infirm Priest Fund of the Archdiocese of Cincinnati. The preamble sets forth that—

"Inasmuch as those who belong to the Sacred Ministry of the Church of the living God have given themselves irrevocably and without reserve to the service of the Lord in the work of saving souls, the faithful of every age, as in duty bound, have made decent provision for their permanent support. In the Old Law the priestly tribe of Levi did not share in the distribution of the promised land, but was supported by the contributions of the other eleven tribes; and in the new the Apostle of the Gentiles, writing to the Corinthians (Ch. IX), speaks of the obligation as emphatically one of divine ordinance. In setting

[14] Ferraris, *Bibl.*, Tit. Ord., § 31.

[15] *Cf.* Conc. Pl. Balt. II, Decr. 77, which has been amended but not repealed by the Third Pl. Council of Balt.

[16] *Comment.* in II. Pl. C. Balt.

forth and enforcing this Christian duty and practice, he employs a variety of arguments and a wealth of illustration. 'Have we not power,' he says, 'to eat and drink? Who serveth as a soldier at any time at his own charges?' And, referring to the injunction in the Law of Moses, he adds: 'These things are written for our sakes, that he that plougheth should plough in hope; and he that thresheth in hope to receive the fruit. If we have sown unto you spiritual things, is it a great matter if we reap your carnal things? Know you not . . . that they that serve the altar partake with the altar? So also the Lord ordained that they who preach the Gospel should live by the Gospel.' In this matter, as in everything else, the Church has followed the practice of Christ and His Apostles, and as they lived by the contributions of the faithful, so also should her ministers. In the primitive ages all goods were in common in the churches, and as no minister was ordained without being adscribed to one of these, that is, without having a title, his services were permanently engaged, and his support was permanently provided for. As time went on, the property, which was at first held in common, was divided up into benefices, which in consequence became established titles for ordination. By a benefice, then, is meant a life-long right to receive from the revenues of a church sufficient for one's decent support, in consideration of the performance of certain ecclesiastical services attached to one's office. It is a life-long right, because he who holds such office, being a priest forever according to the Order of Melchisedec, has given himself entirely and for all time to the service of the Most High God; has put his hands to the plough and may no more look back; has made himself God's portion, and God his; and because, having become a soldier of Christ, and given himself unreservedly to spiritual things, he may no longer seek to make gain or profit from worldly traffic or commerce. Moreover, the Church has made the obligation permanent, foreseeing that, without this provision, her ministers would be solicitous to lay by and hoard up for a coming day; and having done so, she requires of them, by specific law, to spend in works of piety and charity whatever of their revenues is over and above the outlay for their becoming support. Every other title of ordination, whether it be religious poverty, or patrimony, or pension, to be a true one, must answer to the same conditions, that is, it must be permanent and sufficient. 'As it is not becoming,' says the Council of Trent (Sess. XXI de Reform, c. II), 'nor in keeping with the respect due to their state, that those enrolled in the Divine ministry should either beg or engage in any mean occupation, . . . the Holy Synod decrees that from this time forth no secular cleric, although possessing the requisite qualifications of virtue, knowledge, and age, shall be promoted to Sacred Orders, unless it be first duly shown that he is in peaceable possession of an ecclesiastical benefice sufficient for his decent support.' Again: 'Those who have a patrimony,' continues the same decree, 'or who draw an annuity, cannot in future be ordained . . . unless it be first shown that they really possess such patrimony and annuity, and that these are ample for their support during life.'

"Hence, since it is the aim of all titles of ordination to secure the

priest against want, and an unbecoming prostitution of his character, by providing for his decent and permanent support, it follows, by analogous reasoning, that the title of the mission, while having the same duties and obligations attached to it, should have also the same rights and privileges. For if the meaning of an ecclesiastical title be not that it shall secure the priest against want during the term of his natural life after he has grown old in years and broken in health, it can have no meaning at all; because, while he is in the flower of youth and the vigor of manhood, spending his energies for the weal of others about him, he is by the natural law entitled to a decent support. But the priest who is bound unto death by adscription to his Master is not free to avail himself of the privileges of the natural contract. If he engage in commercial pursuits with a view of making money for himself, he is excommunicated, and if he refuse to devote his superfluous revenue to pious and charitable works, he is disobedient to the laws of the Church."

Liability for the Support of Ecclesiastics.

Father P. A. Baart maintains that, "in a strictly legal sense, a priest, ordained by this title (*missionis*), is bound directly to the Propaganda, and indirectly to the diocese or province to which he swears to devote his services."[17] This appears a rather gratuitous assertion; for, according to it, the Propaganda, the *aide-de-camp* of the Supreme Pontiff, could be made responsible for the debt of an honest sustenance in behalf of priests ordained under the title of the mission. But this is contrary to the instruction of the Propaganda, which ordains that "those who are ordained under the title of the mission obtain the necessaries of life from the sacred ministry in the mission to which they are attached."

It is the duty of the ordinary, the chief magistrate and the spiritual governor of his diocese,[18] to see that his, "God's coadjutors,"[19] who by his appointment share in the management of the diocese, and are serving him, are furnished with sufficient means of livelihood.[20] There is, however, no personal liability attached to the ordinary to do so. Moreover, there exists no express, or implicit, or actual contract between bishop and priest, because there never has been a convention, agreement, or specified consideration, the essential element of a contract. The relation of the bishop to his priests is based on obligation *quasi ex contractu*. It

[17] *Legal Formulary*, N. 190.

[18] Act. Ap., 20: 28.

[19] 1 Cor. 3: 9.

[20] *Cf.* S. C. de Prop. Fide, February 4, 1873; also C. Pl. Balt. II, n. 90.

is a relationship of trust and of fealty. If the *titulus missionis* practically implies a contract, it cannot be a legal, but only a moral contract. The consent is implied in the oath, and in the very relationship which the bishop and priest assume towards each other. It is an innominate contract, in which the consent is evident by a part performance designated by the consideration *do ut des; do ut facias; facio ut des;* and *facio ut facias.*

According to the American civil law, bishops are not personally liable to priests for salary. The Supreme Court of Pennsylvania declared, in the case of Tuigg *vs.* Sheehan, that there is no contract obligation for a bishop to pay salary to any priest, who must rely on the duty of his church to support him.[21] In another similar case,[22] the Supreme Court of Michigan rendered the decision that a bishop is only the priest's superior agent; both are common servants of the Church. "No liability for compensation rests on the employing agent, and the means of payment, if they come at all, are to come from another source." The ex-priest Chiniqui, of Kankakee, Ill., brought suit against Bishop O'Regan to recover salary; but the verdict was in favor of the defendant. Civil courts of Pennsylvania declared, in the Stack *vs.* O'Hara litigation, that "every church organization is voluntary on the part of its members, and the terms and conditions depend entirely on its own rules. The profession of priest or minister in any denomination is taken subject to its laws. These he agrees to obey."[23]

According to a decree of the Propaganda, priests have to receive their support from the revenues of the churches and from voluntary gifts of the faithful, who have the conscientious duty to support their pastors.[24] The priests of the United States are chiefly supported by stipulated salaries. The salary, or the recompense paid for services is raised wholly or in part by subscription; or from the income of funds possessed by the congregation; or by assessments upon the members of a congregation, apportioned according to property; or by rents or taxes on pews, especially in urban places; or by donations, collections, and fees, or *jura stolae.* Pastors of many congregations receive a salary which cannot be considered as an equitable remuneration. There are

[21] 101 Penn., 363.
[22] Rose *vs.* Vertin, 46 Mich., 457.
[23] 98 Penn., 233–4.
[24] May 13, 1816.

church members who hold that priests possess Aladdin's lamp somewhere hidden in the church treasury, and consequently can do everything without receiving their salary. It stands to reason that Platonic love will not support a priest. If priests have to lead the life of beggars, they are apt to become an object of contempt. Although secular priests do not take the vow of poverty, their limited finances oblige many of them to practise it in order to keep the wolf from the door. Provident priests seek by privations to possess some "bona parsimonialia;" but only the few have a prospect of laying up the superfluous amount left in their purse as a reserve for the traditional rainy day. There is always the fear lest they "serve God and Mammon." The improvident man will always emphasize the words of the Sermon on the Mount: "Be not solicitous for your life, what you shall eat, nor for your body, what you shall put on."[25] God, they say, will always take care of His children.

American priests are, as a body, more a benevolent than a provident class of gentlemen. Comparatively few of them possess a sinecure in the form of a villa, a farm, a small deposit, or other means, when their health is undermined by hard work, or when their bodily, mental, or moral faculties are on the decline. If the sacerdotal character and dignity remain in them forever, they have a right by natural justice and equity to claim a competent and sufficient livelihood from the Church to the discipline of which they submit themselves as her servants. A *jus Brocardicum* is not allowed in this case. The ecclesiastical jurisprudence has, in fact, promulgated as a law that "it beseems not those who are enrolled in the divine ministry, to beg or to exercise any sordid trade to the disgrace of their order."[26] The tone of this law is general. The Church makes here no distinction between ecclesiastics who are in actual duties, or those who are willing to go on missions if called upon by their proper superiors; neither does she discriminate between aged, infirm, delinquent clerics in Holy Orders. As far as the support of ecclesiastics is concerned, they are all created equal; that means they stand equal before the law in liability and protection. It is the province and the obligation of the proper ecclesiastical superiors to relieve and support all

[25] Matth. 6: 25. [26] Conc. Trid., Sess. 21, cap. 2, De Ref

indigent priests, who, because of old age, sickness, or other disability, are unable to support themselves, and who have no relatives upon whom this legal obligation of support rests.

Canon Law in This Country.

The *corpus Juris Canonici* has not been formally introduced into this country. The Holy See desires, however, that our hitherto uncanonical condition of ecclesiastical government should be entirely discarded and modelled after the disciplinary standard of Catholic countries where the Church is untrammelled by concordate or State interference.[27]

The principles, the drift, the essential spirit, or rather the instinct of canon law has been always and everywhere uniform; but the accidental or accessory forms of canon law are changeable at the different periods of Church life. Canon law as the law of a society which, although divine in its constitution and destination, is human in its form and material life, may be compared to a phenomenon of physiology. The vital principle or the identity of an organic being remains unchanged in any period of life, growth, or development; circumstances affect only the quality of that life. Canon law is, unlike the Chinese law, not a fossil law, mummified in unmeaning formalism; its spirit fertilizes the *nervus disciplinae* of the Church.

The general principles of canon law remain indeed in force in the Catholic Church of this country, whilst their full application is not advisable and would result in "propter jus canonicum juris canonici perdere causas." The Catholic Church is in a formative stage of development in this country. Only a small portion of the existing disciplinary canon law is embodied in the decrees and regulations of our ecclesiastical code. What common law is to Americans, that is canon law to American Catholics. Both are built on precedent, on ancient customs or traditions. Both are abrogated or derogated by statutory enactments of the same category. Canon law holds good in all analogous cases which may occur in this country, or wherever it is applicable to the circumstances. It passes here, as in France, a period of transforma-

[27] *Cf.* Brief to the Apostolic Delegate of the Third Council of Baltimore.

tion. Canon law is divided with regard to its binding force into universal canon law and particular canon law.

UNIVERSAL CANON LAW AND SICK OR AGED ECCLESIASTICS.

Canon law has established the irremovability or canonical permanence of ecclesiastics appointed to a parish church. Pope Gregory the Great laid down as a principle of canon law that an ecclesiastic shall not be deprived of the tenure of his office, parish, or benefice, especially when connected with the care of souls. If by reason of infirmity, old age, or disability, he becomes incapacitated to discharge his proper duties, he is to have an assistant or coadjutor. Both are to receive their becoming support from the revenues of the benefice. When an ecclesiastic, instead of accepting a vicar or a coadjutor, resigns his office or benefice on account of sickness or old age, he is entitled to an annuity or a pension from the income of the benefice given up by him.[28] If a disabled ecclesiastic is not obliged or is unwilling to give up his charge, canon law provides that he also receive an adequate support from the revenues of his benefice. In case the income of his benefice should be insufficient to support the disabled beneficiary and his assistant or vice-gerent, the deficiency must be supplied either from the episcopal *mensa* or from other diocesan sources. Some dioceses maintain institutions for retired or invalid priests over which the respective bishops exercise the power of surveillance and jurisdiction. Canon law devotes a long chapter to this subject of infirm and old ecclesiastics.[29] Sickness or declining age are not sufficient and ample motives for dismissing parish priests from their office, benefice, or charge, save for certain specified delinquencies mentioned in canon law, and this requires the observance of certain formalities of canon law. No discrimination is made there; no exceptions are allowed. All ecclesiastics, the wealthy as well as the indigent, irremovable as well as transferable, have the same rights and the same claims. "Afflicto afflictio non est addenda, imo potius ipsius miseriae miserendum," is the axiom on which this law rests. Another reason for the law is that a lack of provision for old age and infirmity would

[28] Conc. Trid., Sess. 21, c. 4, De Ref.

[29] Decretal. lib. 3, tit. 6, De clerico aegrotante vel debilitato.

cause a great aversion on the part of young men to enter the holy ministry, and consequently would be a cause of deficiency in the numbers of candidates for Holy Orders. Still more, it would be inhuman treatment of clerics. The S. Congregation of the Council, November 26, 1836, says[30] that it is inhuman and entirely unlawful to deprive a cleric, with the testimony of a most honorable life, of his benefice solely on the ground of an incurable disease and a perpetual hindrance. In another similar case (1850) relating to the removal of a movable parish priest, the same S. Congregation pronounced that such a step would be against equity and ecclesiastical polity.[31]

Universal Canon Law and Delinquent Ecclesiastics.

The Catholic Church is always a mother, even to the sons that have betrayed her and are in a wretched condition. The sentence that Pope Clement XI wrote over the door of the Roman prison of San Michele, "Parum est improbos coercere poenâ, nisi bonos efficias disciplinâ," has become the norm of modern penology. Pope Martin V condemned the vicious proposition of Wicleff, that tithes are mere alms which parishioners may refuse to give those of their spiritual superiors who are sinners.[32] It has been the constant practice of the Church that an ecclesiastic who, being in want of the necessaries and decencies of life, if guilty of misdeeds involving a scandalous breach of ecclesiastical discipline, shall, by reason of the indelible mark of the eternal priesthood stamped upon his soul, never be abandoned by his bishop, nor shall he be consigned to penury, vagabondage, mendicancy, contempt, or jeer, or forced to follow a secular avocation by which to gain the means of subsistence; but that he shall receive a share (an alimentary pension) of the revenues of his benefice, or give up his benefice and do penance in a monastery, or in the

[30] "Inhumanum et omnino illegale est clericum, qui aliunde honestissimae vitae sit, incurabili morbo gravatum, et perpetuo impedimento detentum, a beneficio removere."

[31] Certissimum quidem est, ecclesiasticam aequitatem non pati quod ministri, qui longum ac laudabile praebuere servitium indigentiae deserantur, tunc cum ob infirmitatem aliasve causas proprium officium dimittere coguntur."—*Thesaurus resolutionum*, tom. 82, p. 88.

[32] Const. *Inter cunctas*.

ergastulum, that is, in the house of correction for clergymen, where he may be enabled to live in a manner becoming his religious calling.[33] Delinquent ecclesiastics must be left to suffer, but within measure. Their treatment must combine deterrence and amendment. For these undesirable members of her priesthood, the Church always supplies, not conveniences and luxuries of life, but tolerable means of livelihood in case of extremity, as far as it is compatible with clerical decorum. The Fourth Ecumenical Synod of Chalcedon decreed that deposed clerics are to be allowed sustenance from Church property, and this out of compassion for their misery. Only excommunicated clerics, when contumacious, were to be deprived of this privilege, as long as they persisted in their perverse and obstinate ways.

PARTICULAR CANON LAW AND SICK OR AGED ECCLESIASTICS.

The ecclesiastical law of this country is contained in the decrees of the Plenary Councils of Baltimore, in the decrees of provincial and diocesan synods, and in diocesan ordinances and regulations. All of them lay it down that provision is to be made for the welfare of such of the clergy as are no longer able to perform the duties of their sacred calling. "The Church has at all times manifested the tenderest solicitude for such of the laborers in the vineyard as from age or infirmity have been incapacitated for the performance of the duties of the sacred ministry. This, apart from breathing the spirit of true Christian charity, is simple justice; for if it be true that those who serve the altar should partake with the altar, and those who preach the gospel should live by the gospel, it is but right that those who feel themselves called to the service of the altar, and who begin in early boyhood—most generally in a missionary country like ours at their own expense—to fit themselves for so noble a calling, and who, after completing their course, devote all the energies of their being to the service of religion, should look to the Church for support when they have worn themselves out in her service. They are, as a rule, persons who could, by their natural and acquired abilities, succeed in life, but who, animated by higher and holier motives, devote themselves to the service of religion at so very low a salary as renders

[33] Conc. Trid., sess. 23, c. 14, De Ref.

it all but impossible to lay away anything for future needs. This is all the more difficult in a missionary country like ours, where many a priest has had, and still has, to live on less than the meagre salary to which he is entitled. The ecclesiastical authorities in the past generally found themselves so restricted in their resources that it was difficult, if not impossible, for them to devote any of the diocesan funds to the support of disabled or superannuated priests, while they were reluctant to burden the faithful with further demands on their limited resources."[34] The Third Plenary Council of Baltimore decreed that "even irremovable rectors who, though free of crime, are permanently and notoriously disabled, *v. g.*, by chronic disease, from administering their parish or mission, may be deprived of their mission if they refuse to resign, and if, moreover, the circumstances are such that no assistant priest can be assigned them."[35] This is, according to Smith,[36] only possible for grave and urgent reasons in behalf of the general good. An ecclesiastic who resigns his parish on account of sickness or advanced age cannot be left without sufficient means, as well as he whose resignation is forced. In either case the bishop must see that a congruous support be given them.[37] Priests should hardly be treated with less consideration than retired soldiers of the army of the United States, whose authorized allowance is three-fourths of the monthly pay allowed them by law in the grade held when retired, from which sum the monthly tax of twelve and a half cents for support of the Soldiers' Home is deducted.[38] The deceased Dr. A. E. Mather, Financial Secretary of the Baptist Ministers' Aid Society, writes in his Report for 1899 as follows: "The civilization of our age demands that the State furnish support for its veteran soldiers; cities for their veteran firemen and teachers; and corporations for their disabled employees, because of valuable service rendered. How much more promptly and cheerfully should Christian churches provide generous support for veteran soldiers of the Cross, who have been

[34] Annual Report of the Clerical Relief Association of the Diocese of Pittsburg, 1898.

[35] N. 38, VII.

[36] *Elem. of Eccl. Law*, n. 419.

[37] *Ibid.*, n. 390.

[38] Regulations for the Army of the United States, n. 138.

divinely designated leaders in the work of saving men and training them for service to God and humanity! They are spiritual fathers, who have toiled with self-denying fidelity until, arrested by the infirmities of age, and pinched by relentless poverty, they, by divine right, turn to their brethren for relief and support. Shall they be disappointed, and with sad hearts turn away to suffer in silence, or be supported by the State as paupers. They are not paupers. They are battle-scarred heroes, whose labors have been of unspeakable value, and demand recognition by the ministrations of Christian love." Bishop Watterson, of Columbus, remarked in his Circular Letters for 1888 and 1891, that it is but right and just that the whole diocese should provide its priests with relief in their infirmities and comfort in their old age, and because the priests are an essential part of the diocese. "Our priests are ordained, not for any particular parish, but for the diocese, and it is but right and just that the whole diocese should provide them with relief in their infirmities, and comfort in their old age. It is true, that no parish animated with the spirit of religion will fail to provide what is needful for the health and comfort of its pastor as long as he is with it; but it is also the duty of the diocese to establish a fixed and permanent means of relief for those of the clergy who may be overtaken by sickness in their work, or disabled by age and long ministry in the vineyard of the Lord."

A high-minded or sensitive priest is not likely to apply for assistance from the Church when he has ample resources of his own.

Particular Canon Law and Delinquent Ecclesiastics.

The problem of how to deal with clerical failures is probably one of the most vexed in connection with efforts for their relief. This tragic class appeals to our charity and sympathy. Something should be done to solve effectually the difficulty. If it is human to err, then the Church cannot, even in her anxiety to guard the honor of her sacred army, ignore the responsibility of maintaining her erring and impoverished clerics by declaring them to be an intolerable nuisance. Such a *laissez-faire* policy would lack the spirit of the Good Samaritan, of Christian love and forbearance. If a cleric whose acts are prejudicial to the ecclesias-

tical state, and who is not infrequently a victim of untoward circumstances, should be refused the means of subsistence from the Church, he would be more sinned against than sinning. The support of delinquent clerics cannot be treated as an open question.

The Catholic Church of this country recognizes the expediency and propriety of giving aid to an unworthy and at the same time indigent cleric. When ample testimony establishes the fact that an ecclesiastic has, through vicious indulgence or improper habits, slighted or neglected his duties to such a degree as to make it unsafe to intrust him with a parochial charge, and when it is shown by specific statements and the deposition of reputable witnesses willing to substantiate the charges which are made, so that they prove him incorrigible, then an unconditional and immediate resignation must be forwarded him. The Second Plenary Council of Baltimore,[39] adopting a decree from the Provincial Council of St. Louis, declares that priests who have been deprived of their ministry by sentence of their ordinary have no claim on him for support, they having by their own fault rendered themselves unfit for missionary work. The Third Plenary Council of Baltimore has modified this decree by sanctioning that bishops are bound to place "fallen" or strayed priests in some religious house, monastery, or ecclesiastical asylum, where they shall be supported by the diocese during a reasonable period of deserving probation. At the same time they find there a shelter and refuge in accordance with their sacred character, and are neither condemned to a precarious existence nor exposed to certain shipwreck which sinks them with others into a mire of scandal. "The Church does this, not so much as a matter of justice, or out of consideration for the offender, as out of regard for the ecclesiastical dignity;"[40] or, as the Propaganda expresses it, "quo efficacius aberrantes in semitam rectam reducantur."[41] Bishops are not at liberty to rid themselves of the unpleasant obligation entailed by these exactments, and though a priest may incur the displeasure of his bishop, he cannot be

[39] n. 77.

[40] Smith, *Elem.*, n. 1866.

[41] Resp. ad dubia, Feb. 4, 1873.

detached at pleasure and turned adrift from his diocese before he has secured another bishop.[42] In the meantime such a cleric must receive his support from the diocese to which he belongs. But it must be observed that delinquency and contumacy are not to be confounded. The lamentable condition of a contumacious or rebellious cleric is but the natural punishment of his fault and folly. He need not pretend to lay any claim to Church support.

If delinquent clerics have their patrimony or other sources of income, and consequently are not in want, the bishop is not obliged to make any allowance for their maintenance.[43]

Sources of Revenue.

It is a very difficult task to determine the best method for extending relief to the deserving but needy ecclesiastic. The scheme that commends itself for one diocese is often impracticable in another. But the general sentiment of this country has approved the support of disabled clerics who are indigent, and various dioceses have made corresponding provisions. It is a Sisyphean task without official statistics at hand to outline the labyrinth of fluctuating diocesan rules regarding this support, or even to comment upon them, to use a lawyer's term, *passim*, that is to say, how they are here, there, and everywhere.

The various methods may be grouped into two classes—the segregated or individual method and the aggregated method. The first is practised in very poor or new dioceses with a limited number of secular priests. Such dioceses have no funds for infirm, superannuated, or delinquent priests; matters are there in a dormant condition. In some of them a movement is at present on foot to start a concerted organization. But they all use their best endeavors to take care of disabled priests in some way. Old and infirm priests are willingly accepted at the episcopal residence, doing such work as their strength allows; or they are looked after in some of the diocesan institutions. Should a priest fall into trouble, he can voluntarily leave a diocese where his use-

[42] II Pl. C. Balt., n. 122.

[43] *Cf.* answer of the S. C. Propaganda to Postulatum of Bishop Luers, of Fort Wayne

fulness has ceased, and seek another field of missionary labor, to build up anew.

There are few dioceses indeed which have not nowadays their quota of infirm, old, or delinquent priests unable to perform duty, and which are therefore not in immediate need to treat "the hunger argument."

In another article I shall give a description of the aggregated methods which have been adopted in most of our dioceses.

ANSELM KROLL.

La Crosse, Wis.

DE USU ET ABUSU SCHOLASTICAE DISPUTATIONIS.[1]

I.—SCRIPTURA.

"MUNDUM tradidit Deus *disputationibus* hominum."[2] Disputatio oritur ab ovo. Quinimmo, ante mundi constitutionem, "Michael archangelus, cum diabolo *disputans*, altercatus est."[3] Eva mater, eheu! prima fallaciis diaboli aures admovit, succubuitque victima. "*Disputare* cum Deo cupio," asseruit Job,[4] et reapse longum disputavit, etsi non in forma, tamen excellente et sublimi via. Hoc ipsum ausus est et Jeremias.[5]

Judaei, "*disputantes* cum Stephano, non poterant resistere."[6] Paulus disputavit cum Graecis;[7] in synagogis cum Judaeis;[8] per tres menses in Epheso;[9] in schola tyranni;[10] profecturus in crastinum;[11] usquedum ductus somno cecidit.[12] Quasi continua disputatio fuit vita Pauli super terram; nec quivis unquam disputans tanta polluit convincendi virtute et refellendi.

Ecclesiastes praecipua connotat disputationum vitia: "Verba sunt plurima, multamque in *disputando* habentia vanitatem; et quid necesse est homini majora se quaerere?"[13]

Auctor ergo syllogismi et disputationum in forma nil invenit omnino sub coelo novum. Si, quemadmodum refertur, lecto

[1] Paper read at the Overbrook Conference of Seminary Directors.

[2] Ecclesi. 3: 11. [3] Judae. 9. [4] Job 13: 3. [5] Jeremias 12: 1.
[6] Act. 6: 9. [7] *Ib.* 9: 29. [8] Judae. 17: 17; 18: 4; 18: 19.
[9] 19: 8. [10] 19: 9. [11] 20: 7.
[12] 20: 9. [13] Ecclesi. 6: 11; 7: 1.

Moyse, exclamavit: "Barbarus ille bene loquitur, sed nihil probat," plus momenti, quam decuit, syllogismo tribuit suo.

Quum autem non semper in humanis, sicut in sacris supra memoratis disputationibus, sapientia est et Spiritus, qui loquuntur, sine mora asserere libet, quod systema disputationis Aristotelicum, ex quo inventum, hucusque insuperatum remansit.

II.—Pontifices et Concilia.

Post encomia, quibus Pius V (1567), Sixtus V (1587), Pius IX (1863), et Leo XIII (1879), methodum scholasticam cumulaverunt, in qua disputatio indubitanter includitur, vix catholico philosopho licet, "quin auctoritatem Ecclesiae in quaestionem vocet" (verba Pii IX), amplius contra stimulum calcitrare.

Ad memoriam revocat fauste regnans Pontifex, quod in Conciliis Viennensi, Lugdunensi, Florentino, Tridentino, Vaticanoque, juxta Scripturam Sacram et decreta Pontificum, libri scholasticorum (disputationibus referti), ut norma fidei habiti fuerint: dolendum esse dicens, quod tam parum modernis temporibus scholastica floruerit. Cujus renovationi nemo majorem operam et studium magis assiduum contulit; haec non minima multarum palmarum Pontificis gloria.

Jampridem innotescit quid commodi debeat inesse methodo ab auctoritatibus summis summopere commendatae.

III.—Historia.

Disputationis Methodus, quam apud cunctas gentes humanitate politas semper reperimus, haud potest commoda non conferre humanae cognitioni, quacum tam intime consonare visa est.

1°. Et Indus Kapila ratiocinium ut fontem cognitionis humanae perhibuit. Gotama librum *Njaja*, i. e. ratiocinium, scripsit. Immo aliquam ratiocinandi artem tradere conatus, leges argumentationis posuit Aristotelicis proximas. Easdem ex quinque partibus constare docuit: (*a*) thesi probanda; (*b*) ratione thesim probante; (*c*) exemplo illustrante; (*d*) applicatione exempli ad thesim; (*e*) conclusione. Et sic arguitur: (*a*) Mons ardet; (*b*) nam fumat; (*c*) quidquid fumat ardet; (*d*) sic fumat mons; (*e*) ergo ardet. Quam parum argumentatio haec ab Aristotelica differat manifeste liquet.

2°. Apud Graecos cognitionis methodus incessit a perceptione ad Dialecticam, sive apodicticam cognitionem; exinde ad argumentationem. Omnibus Sophistis opposuit se Socrates, qui subtilitate disputandi eos refellebat. Ad confutanda Sophistarum captiosa argumenta necesse fuit regulas rectae argumentationis inquirere. Incepit Socrates, a particulari ad universale assurgens, rerum praebere definitionem: huic debetur inductio ad definiendum.

Longius Plato processit: ab unitate per definitionem descendit ad dividendas res secundum multitudinem; sicque *συναγογῃ* addidit *διαίρεσιν*, i. e. synthesim, viam ostendens ad ratiocinium.

Aristoteles perfecit opus, addendo ratiocinium definitioni Socraticae et Platonicae divisioni, perceptionem et judicia analytica in conclusionem argumentativam resolvens. Summam operam contulit, ut methodum ratiocinandi, quam syllogisticam vocavit, accurate excoleret.

3°. Apud Romanos Tullius "hanc artem bene disserendi et vera et falsa dijudicandi, verbo graeco *διαλεκτικὴν* appellatam," ab Aristotele didicit. Aristoteleo se more usum esse confessus est; quamvis, ut recte Sanseverino monet,[14] "pauca tantum ex Topicis deduxit, eaque magis ad rhetoricam quam ad dialecticam spectantia." Attamen facundus orator, Aristotelem principem agnoscens, apodicticam artem dialecticae subjecit.

4°. In disciplinis catholicis idem occurrit evolutionis philosophicae processus. Via magis Platonica et apodictica, quanquam syllogismis identidem sparsa, incesserunt Patres Apostolici in dogmate exponendo et haereticis oppugnandis. Quorum argumenta Scholastici colligentes, pressius urgentes, novaque addentes, omnia syllogisticae methodo submiserunt: ex quo orta est architectonica solidissimaque structura et Summa, quae, basilicarum instar, admiratio mundi facta est.

Nullum, ad aedificationem philosophiae christianae, instrumentum validius adhiberi potuisset, quam firmissima Methodus Aristotelica, omnes mentis operationes complectens, et securo tramite in earumdem exercitatione dirigens. Unde commodum duplex accrevit, et syllogismo, qui stabilitate indelebili catholicas disciplinas fundavit, atque etiam Ecclesiae Catholicae, cujus doc-

[14] III, pag. 145.

trina accuratissimum methodi syllogisticae scrutinium triumphanter sustinuit.

Cum ab actu ad posse valeat illatio, ex commodis, quae scholasticae disputationes per saecula praestiterunt, ad futura concludere licet.

IV.—Auctoritas Humana—*Pro.*

Vix finis esset scribendi, si laudes referre vellem, quibus commoda scholasticae disputationis elata sunt; satis sit adducere pauca, quibus sive adversarii, sive in neutram partem propensi, causae syllogisticae gratis servierunt.

1°. Eclecticus Cousin scripsit: "Il est impossible que la forme de la pensée n'influe pas sur la pensée elle-même, et que la décomposition du raisonnement dans les trois termes qui le constituent ne rende pas plus distincte et plus sûre la perception des rapports de convenance et de disconvenance qui les unissent ou les séparent. Amenées ainsi face à face, la majeure, la mineure et la conséquence manifestent d'elles-mêmes leur vrai rapport, et la seule vertu de leur énumeration précise et de leur disposition régulière s'oppose à l'introduction des rapports chimériques, dissipe les fantômes, dont l'imagination remplit les intervalles du raisonnement."[15]

2°. Jam Leibnitz scripserat: On trouvera plus souvent qu'on ne pense (en examinant les paralogismes des auteurs), qu'ils ont péché contre les règles de la logique; et j'ai moi-même experimenté quelquefois, en disputant même par écrit avec des personnes de bonne foi, qu'on n'a commencé à s'entendre que lorsqu'on a argumenté en forme, pour débrouiller un chaos de raisonnements."[16] Idem, scribens ad Wagner:[17] "Es ist bewandt, sagt er, dass man, nemlich in wichtigen, zumal theologischen Streitsachen, . . . wohl thut, wenn man alles mit grossem Fleisse auflöset, und auf die allereinfältigsten und handgreiflichsten Schlüsse bringt, da auch der geringste Schüler unfehlbar sehen kann, was folge oder nicht; und wird sich finden, dass man oft bei wichtigen Gesprächen stecken bleiben und still stehen müsse, weil man von der Form abgewichen, gleichwie man einen Zwirnknäuel zum

[15] *Hist. gén. de la philosophie*, 2e leçon.

[16] *Nouveaux essais sur l'entend.*, l. 4, c. 17.

[17] *Apud Erdm.*, p. 422a.

Gordischen Knoten machen kann, wenn man ihn unordentlich aufthut."

3°. In Alzog[18] reperimus: "Only the prejudiced and those to whom thought is laborious, and by whom speculation is regarded as dangerous, have presumed to deny to Scholasticism its great scientific importance. Quite different has been the judgment of Bossuet, Leibnitz, Hegel, and all great thinkers, whether within or without the Church. . . . One cannot help but regret that its principles, its accurate method of thought, its loyalty to truth, its culture and learning, its chivalric enthusiasm, and its dauntless courage, have not now their hold on men's minds, and are not now as popular as then."

4°. Quin etiam Henr. Cornel. Agrippa, in libello[19] non potuit quin confiteretur: "Scholasticos multum in controversiis contra infideles inservisse, mentis facultates optimum instituisse et ad sanum efficiendum judicium contulisse."

5°. Prolationes absolvam cum insignibus his amici Tongiorg verbis:[20] "Methodo syllogistica nihil accomodatius ad disputationis finem, nihil opportunius ad colligendos disputationis fructus et ad vitia praecavenda, quae in disputationem obrepere possunt; nihil necessarium magis. Crede mihi: multi, qui et voce et scripto et editis voluminibus putant se aliquam veritatem defendisse, vel adversarium confutasse, si adduci possint, ut quaecumque disputaverunt ad formam syllogisticam exigant, statim animadverterent, se eleganter fortasse declamasse, erudite scripsisse, descripsisse eleganter, at vero simul se a scopo aberasse, demonstrasse nihil, nihil refutasse, quinimmo ne clare percepisse quidem, quid sibi demonstrandum vel refutandum sit. Iterum crede mihi: si haec disceptandi ratio, in rebus praesertim subtilioribus et implexis, vel in iis, quae ignem cupiditatum humanarum excitant, universim adhiberetur, quaestiones multae, quae hinc inde acri studio agitantur, servata pace, quiescerent; multae nullo negotio solverentur; multae, quae solutae putantur, insolutae atque insolubiles agnoscerentur; multi errores, simul atque orti sunt, extabescerent; irae, animi atque spiritus pertinaciter concertantium vix locum haberent."

[18] *Universal Church History*, Vol. II, p. 736.
[19] *De Vanitate scientiar.*, l. 6, p. 97.
[20] *Log.*, n. 350.

V.—AUCTORITAS HUMANA—*Con.*

Sicut numismatum, ita disputationum duae sunt facies. Disputatio disputationi subjecta est, nostrae considerationi proponens quousque systema aeneum lima momorderit censoria: hoc tamen praevio notare velim, quod usus disputationum minus quam abusus earumdem vellicatus sit.

1°. Multum, si non multa, nostri conquesti sunt Aristarchi, ex quo mellifluus S. Bernardus angustiora sibi dilatare conatus est syllogismi confinia, usque ad ingeniosum *Idiota*, hisce exclamans verbis:[21] "And lo! not a particle of dust was touched or flicked away from dusty, dead folios; but here, spick and span, were trotted out airy nothings about ephemeral and transient every-day existences; and he had not got a chance of saying: *Sic argumentaris, Domine!* Evidently these men had never heard of a syllogism in their lives. And then everything was so curt and short as to be almost contemptuous. Clearly these men had something to do in the work-a-day world besides splitting hairs with a young Hibernian."

Postea sese offert nobis *Delmege* in Maynooth, "where *he spun* syllogisms as *a spider spins* his webs, and *drew* unwary flies into *their* viscous and deadly *clutches*."

Non nova, nec nove, neque emendate dicta, quamvis attico sale conspersa. Delmege, who *spun*, as *a* spider *spins and drew into their clutches*, contra duplicem syllogisticam et grammaticam formam peccat, fidem faciens, quod contemptores formae pulvinar pigritiae sapiant. Sed, vix aliqua pagina distans, in eodem libello, occurrit opportuna emendatio: "Some hold that a sermon ought to be a syllogism in disguise. . . . Hence the grave duty of being prepared, not only to support the truths of Catholic faith by solid arguments, but also to point out the weakness of objections urged against it. Neither of these can be done without practical skill in the art of reasoning."

Melius Seneca "of splitting hairs" scripsit:[22] "Simile confuso est, quidquid in pulverem sectum est."

Et ipse Thomas, de *micrologia* sapide conquerens, ait:[23] "Quod

[21] AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW, May, 1900.

[22] Epist. 89.

[23] l. 2 met. lec. 5.

quaedam sit importunitas et illiberalitas, si homo velit circa cognitionem veritatis etiam minima discutere."

2°. Acrius H. C. Agrippa locutus est *of* "a confused mesh of words, discussing most futile questions, dealing blows in the air." [24]

Miserandus F. de Lamennais, sermone rythmico, cujus nec caput nec pes apparet, de scholastica sic conquestus est: [25]

> "Elle avait deux grands yeux stupidement ouverts,
> Dont l'un ne voyait pas ou voyait de travers."

Utinam infelix homo, melius scholasticis disciplinis imbutus, non tam transversa catholicam philosophiam et theologiam tractasset!

Quid mirum! si Scholastica, ementita veste induta, irrisioni datur! Quod futiles quaestiones attinet, Thomas illis obviam venit: [26] "Quaestiones in tantum sunt amandae, in quantum ducunt ad veritatem. . . . Quaestiones autem stultae non ducunt ad veritatem, sed ad litem, quae est vitanda."

3°. Neque stylo pepercerunt, horrendam barbariem exprobantes. Latinitatem scholasticam fusius, et modo magistri Paulsen vindicavit.[27] Satis sit, quod Leo XIII, nihil cunctatus, summopere sermonem S. Thomae commendavit.

Scholastici, quamvis "non timuerint ferulas grammaticorum, dum ad solidam certioremque veritatem pervenirent," nihilo secius, ut plurimum, clara concinnaque lingua usi sunt. Propriam terminologiam, ex Aristotele praecipue deductam, adoptaverunt, modo cujuscumque peculiaris scientiae; attamen, ut recte animadvertit Herder,[28] pauciora in multis voluminibus Thomae et Suarezii idiomata reperiuntur, quam in unico nostrae aetatis scientistarum tomo.

Quis credat, quod auctor officii SS. Sacramenti stylo caruerit, qui tam anguste et felici exitu poesiam theologiamque copulavit, ut ipse Dantus, dum catholicas doctrinas pulcherrimis carminibus exornavit, vix idem perfectionis poeticae fastigium attigerit! Unde Santeuil, hymnologii gallicani auctor, se paratum declaravit

[24] Alzog, II, p. 902.
[25] *Études*, 20 Mai, 1900, p. 439.
[26] C. 2. ep. ad Tim., l. 3.
[27] Geschichte des Gelehrt. Unter. Leipzig, 1885: 22, 27.
[28] *Art. Scholastic.*, p. 1891.

hymnos omnes ventis dare, si tantum haec quatuor carminula sibi adscriberentur:

> "Se nascens dedit socium,
> Convescens in edulium,
> Se moriens in pretium,
> Se regnans dat in praemium."

Barbara si sunt haec: liceat mihi barbarus esse.

4°. Absit ut praeteriam quod aetas nostra saepius objicit: i. e. syllogisticam methodum inductioni et inventioni esse damnosam. Laus et admiratio, quibus philosophiae naturalis principes animum Aristotelis res novas excogitandi solertem prosecuti sunt, injustum repellunt opprobium.[29] Gratry summatim sequentia proffert: "On ignore vulgairement combien le Père du syllogisme a parlé de l'induction. La raison, dit-il nettement, a deux procédés, ni plus ni moins: l'un est l'induction, et l'autre le syllogisme. . . . L'induction est le passage du particulier à l'universel; les raisonnements inductifs sont ceux qui montrent l'universel dans la lumière du particulier. L'induction donne le principe et l'universel, le syllogisme déduit de l'universel. L'induction est la voie qui conduit aux majeures."[30]

Quâ citatione quasi manu ducimur ad penitius enucleandam rationem intrinsecam commodorum, quae derivant a disputationibus scholasticis.

VI.—Ratio.

Campum cognitionis humanae universum dialectica et demonstratio occupant. Media est dialectica inter artem rhetoricam et demonstrationem. Ad veritatis inventionem, sive ad analysim et inductionem, dialectica refertur, sicut demonstratio ad veritatis probationem.

Prior verisimilitudine fundatur, assensum non necessarium, sed tantum opinionem generat; posterior cum veritate nexum habet necessarium. Dialectica faciem tantum exteriorem, *τὰ ἔξωθεν* scientiae exhibet; Demonstratio autem internas causas rerum ingreditur, *τὰ ἔξωθεν* scientiae constituit. Prior, quum sit

[29] Vide testimonia Cuvier, Blainville, Geoffroy S. Hilaire, etc.; Pesch, Welträths, I, p. 93, sqq.

[30] *Log.*, p. 16.

indagatrix, ad scientiae omnis principia viam ducit. Ambae duplex systema cognitionis, analyticum scilicet atque syntheticum, comprehendunt, quorum processus his aureis verbis Thomas explicuit:[31] "In rebus plurimis non statim a principio eam cognitionem perfectam acquirere possumus, quae ex demonstratione nascitur. Facile autem, post res sensibus apprehensas, intellectus ad communiores de rebus notitias pervenire potest, quas si compertas habemus, de rebus opiniones sive sententias probabiles acquirimus, ita ut de rebus modo id, modo aliud, modo oppositum videatur esse verum. Atque ea est de rebus cognitio, quae disquisitione dialectica commode perficitur, et tum quidem perfici potest, quum intellectus demonstrationis nondum capax est. Postquam autem per dialecticam multas de aliqua re rationes probabiles adepti sumus, in mente elucescit veritas post diluculum, et mens videt demonstrationem, quae institui potest. Atqui hoc modo opinio ex syllogismo dialectico causata, est via ad scientiam, quae per demonstrationem acquiritur."

Disputatio scholastica, super syllogismum demonstrativum fundata, ad perfectionem evehitur, per exclusionem errorum; nam, ut Thomas ait,[32] "ad scientiam concurrit in sui acquisitionem expulsio contrarii." De hac ultima Aristoteles:[33] "Quod quis sciat, inquit, in utramque partem disputare, duplicem utilitatem habet: unam, quod adversarium redarguere, eique quod vult extorquere possit, ut facili deinde negotio eum confundat; alteram, quod videns quid cujusque propositionis sit consequens, veritatem ipsam facilius cognoscat: relictum esse enim ad inveniendam veritatem, ut e duobus propositionibus, quae intra se pugnant, altera recte eligatur, altera rejiciatur."

Me fugit omnino quid objici possit his magistrorum verbis.

VII.—Conclusio.

In ipsa disputatione, moderatore sapienti conducta, secundum regulas a philosophis accuratissime delineatas, "multae quaestiones nasci solent, ut est apud T. Pesch,[34] quibus ingenia cogni-

[31] III, qu. 3, ad 2.
[32] 2 dist. 9, q. 1 ad 2.
[33] L. 8 *Topic.*, c. 14.
[34] *Instit. Log.* I, p. 222.

tionis et scientiae cupida ad res penitius perscrutandas vehementer excitantur. Accedit, ut et ordinate cogitare discamus, et judicare maturius, et sermonem instituere ad persuadendum oppositum. Quum in disputationis fervore in omnem sese partem mens vertere cogatur, ut quid commode ad singula objecta sit respondendum inveniat, fieri non potest, quin ea etiam occurrant, quae secus vel nunquam vel non nisi per longissimam meditationem mentem subiissent."

Nemo securius campum disputationis circumscripsit quam Thomas, qui, ut omnibus vagationibus incommodisque disputationum occurreret, gemmam nobis reliquit *Opusculum de Fallaciis*, in quo Sophisticam, tendentem ad gloriam, ut sapiens videatur, omni vana falsaque veri apparentia despoliavit, triumphantem relinquens genuinam disputationem, sive actum syllogisticum unius ad alterum, ad aliquid propositum ostendendum.

Hinc valde optandum est, ut, in quavis philosophiae schola, methodus syllogistica vigeat; ut semel in hebdomada integra disputatio locum habeat: ut identidem, decursu anni, publicae et solemnes disputationes animos discipulorum praeparent ad tuendas et defendendas, coram ornatissima adstantium corona, philosophiae et theologiae catholicae doctrinas. Inde efficietur, ut alumni res clare percipiant, definiant, dividant, sane de iisdem judicent, rationes earumdem solide propugnent et contra opponentes vindicent; tandem ut concinne loquantur, et linguae Ecclesiae magistri evadant.

A. VASSAL.

Civitate Columbensi.

SCHOLASTIC METHODS, THEIR ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES.[1]

BEFORE entering upon our subject, let us recall in a general way our idea of method.

What do we understand by method? In the first place it may be defined as the process of mental formation, by which the pupil—in our case the seminarian—is trained. Every method

[1] Paper read at the Overbrook Conference of Seminary Directors.

plays pretty much the same part to the mind that the alphabet does to language. We master the A, B, C, and learn how to read, and presently the eye flits along the page. So the youthful mind grows under the sway of method till its operations seem finally to be almost *ex ipsa mentis natura.* Again, method it is which digests, classifies, and labels the subject-matter of study. Moreover, method furnishes a lifelong apparatus for mental work.

In every turn of life, in every unexpected event, on great and small occasions, like the tools of the mechanic, our method is at hand, a formed, developed, masterful apparatus, by which we cut the Gordian knot, open up the unexplored field, solve the subtle doubt, or escape the mazes of a difficulty. It may indeed be said that in a great measure it is the method which educates rather than its subject-matter. To sum up, a method is indispensable.

Turning now to our subject, we learn what we are to understand by scholastic methods. "The method of the schoolmen," says Brownson, "was the peripatetic method adopted before the advent of our Lord, and their logic was the Organon of Aristotle." Looking at scholastic methods in the light of history, we find that they have a very respectable origin and career.

Scholastic methods were followed by Jew and Arab, from whom the schoolmen drafted them into the service of Christianity. At the beginnings of the universities of Europe, law and medicine held the place of honor; but the schoolmen, learning the Aristotelian methods and philosophy from the Jewish and Arabian schools of Spain, reconciled them with the traditions of religious teaching and gave us scholastic theology and philosophy.

Really and truly, scholastic philosophy originated in the theology of the Church, and was connected with ancient philosophy chiefly by means of so much of ancient philosophy as the Church has received and assimilated through the early Fathers.

Brownson in our day, as St. Augustine among the Fathers and John Scotus Erigena at the dawn of the schoolmen, held the identity of religion and philosophy. The latter, declares the American philosopher, is nothing but the practical teachings of religion referred to their ontological principles and reduced to doctrinal form. Truly a noble appreciation of philosophy! Harnack

throws it into a proportion. Scholasticism in the thirteenth century is to the sphere of knowledge as the Church is to the sphere of human life.

Scholasticism is at once official and in possession. It has stood the test of centuries with varying respect and forgetfulness. Although Papal briefs are needed to prop it up, yet the system to which Aquinas and Bonaventure, Scotus and Occam, Suarez and Vasquez clung, must have something at bottom worthy of such illustrious disciples. The merit of the scholastics, moreover, lies in the use and application, which they made of the philosophy inherited from Gentile sources, in the exposition and defense of Catholic doctrine. As Harnack puts it, "Aristotle the politician and Augustine the theologian—two enemies—became allies in Thomas Aquinas."

After this short retrospect we may define the meaning of scholastic methods *in se* as methods which look for and labor to find the rational foundation of Christian truth.

The scholastic method, according to Hergenröther, rests upon the axiom, faith precedes science, fixes its boundaries, prescribes its conditions.

Furthermore, this ardent supporter of scholasticism lays down its principles and methods thus:

1. Scholastic philosophy is seriously distinguished from scholastic theology. It has its *point de depart* not in dogma, but in universal verities.

2. It aims, not at certitude, but at evidence, because before philosophizing, the certitude of principles should be clearly grasped.

3. It desires to establish philosophic propositions. But in this the scholastic is not confined to deducing from a principle by way of deduction the consequence it leads to; he may use every rational means that may give certainty; *v. g.*, facts of experience, data of history; in a word, any and every reliable source.

Scholastic methods improve, strengthen, and develop present ideas, from which we may elicit new concepts, but are not expected to discover or create new notions.

We may now inquire what is the actual value,—that is, what are the disadvantages and advantages of scholastic methods, when we apply their use to the seminaries of the United States. For

the more practical purpose of direct illustration, let us introduce ourselves to a young levite, who, cap in hand, stands before the rector of the seminary to be assigned to his room, to don cassock and biretta, and to have his class work marked out.

Look at him! Born of a Catholic family in the middle ranks of life, or even poorer, he has been educated, sometimes wholly in the parochial school and Catholic college; as a rule, however, in the parochial school partly and partly in the public; at times in a boarding college, again in a day institute.

From the day he was able to read, his ordinary sources of knowledge, outside school and text-books, were the family circle, the daily press, the Sunday sermon, the Catechism, the intercourse with his school-fellows, the novel, rarely the old-fashioned, but rather the up-to-date romance, if even as much as all this.

If a public school boy, many of his companions were non-Catholics; and this companionship was the same during play hours and free days, even if he attended a parochial school. In his family there may have been members of different creeds. A large proportion of his schoolmates are at work, clerking for the most part; a few in factories; a handful at trades.

In college he studied Latin and got a smattering of Greek, hardly ever mastering the classics thoroughly. He has the merest acquaintance with deeper mathematics and science. He may speak perhaps of calculus and then add that biology and chemistry, astronomy and physics were taught one hour or so weekly. His text-books in the ancient languages are Virgil and Cicero, Xenophon and Thucydides, and a few more. In English are pondered over the classical standards, the popular authors—nearly all Protestants—to whom scholastic methods, as a rule, are as alien as the beauties of Chinese literature. Our young levite knows that Ruskin's style is prose-poetry; Hawthorne's imagination pure; *Lorna Doone* a model of English; Mathew Arnold an enthusiastic defender of Keltic influence.

Leaving the Superior's office with the good man's benign blessing, the levite goes to the room assigned him. We follow. There he dons his cassock, which covers his past studies about as much as it does his body—very much more than it hides his spirit, training, and education.

While in philosophy and theology he will follow scholastic methods, yet in other subjects, *v.g.*, in Sacred Scripture, Church history, and science, if any is taught, he will continue on in the old ways.

On the one hand, the levite finds that in logic and ontology a sweeping major leads off all his author's propositions; and in theology a text of Sacred Scripture or a decree of the Church stands for the universal.

On the other hand, in his other studies, Sacred Scripture and Church history, he goes from data to data; chemistry and biology, likewise, lead him on in the Baconian path. His psychology runs counter in some measure to the experimental studies in that branch, so widespread and popular nowadays. There are five senses he will learn in the seminary, while his former schoolmates hear in the neighboring universities that the new psychology may come eventually to look on them as in root but one,—touch.

In his efforts to get to the bottom of things philosophical, the *materia prima* is held to be *materia iners*, notwithstanding the protest of Boscovitch. But against this, biology will carry him back to the germ cell, and chemistry to the atomic theory. In other words, one hour a day is spent after scholastic methods; the next in following experimental or Baconian; all the while, however, little if any original thinking or research is required, much less done.

At the parting of college days, our levite's schoolmates enter law, medical, or other professional schools, and during their career in them, as also throughout their future life, their early training is developed and the methods of study are identical at least in system. The current thought of the day, the writings and speeches of public men, are all in harmony with their professional studies. Once the sheepskin is won, they enter life all of a piece, with their past preparation, collegiate and professional.

On the other hand, the seminarian cries halt—at least officially—in great measure to his past training. While following the methods in vogue, in chemistry, physics, and biology, he is on fairly well-known grounds; when, however, he treads the mazes of philosophy or theology he is *in terra aliena*. How bewildering to the levite!

Ordained priest, the young Melchisedech steps forth into the arena, there to face men trained at Harvard or Georgetown, Columbia or Washington, Yale or Notre Dame, to speak to women graduates of Manhattan or Vassar, Bryn Mawr or Eden Hall, Govanstown or Wellesly. Now in such intercourse, in sermons, in reading the daily paper, in perusing the magazine, in devouring the popular novel, will he follow his scholastic training or must he not fall back on his early training?

It is not unknown how every priest has to adapt, boil down, make easy his scholastic turns of expression, before he reaches the plain, everyday thoughts of his congregation. To neglect this would be to talk over their heads.

A priest should be no alien in his own land; nor does the Catholic Church tend to create a caste in any land; the nations of mankind are hers. A youth's formation, therefore, in educational, social, and civil life, should not only not unfit him for the priesthood, rather should his priesthood be congenial to all his training; to his boyhood and youth; his home and friendships; his civil status and public life.

Which method will influence the developing character of the young pastor? That which is in the air? Which he has drank in from boyhood and developed in most of his studies? Or that at which he strained during half his time in the seminary when he was already pretty well formed?

Again, the good behavior of Americans, their easy business relations and respect for authority of all kinds, prove that a wide diversity of opinions, methods, studies, practices, and beliefs are compatible in the social order and daily life. Our seminarians drink in this spirit.

In thus picturing the young levite on the threshold and during his seminary course, we have brought out enough of the disadvantages of scholastic methods. This is but one-half our task. Let us now look at their advantages.

No one can gainsay the need of a method, and to drop scholastic methods would leave us in a vortex. With John Stuart Mill, we need not be ashamed to acknowledge the debt which modern philosophy owes to scholasticism. True, the bloom of any and every system soon passes away, but its root ideas, if the system is

sound, remain, " La scolastique est tombé faute d'hommes et non pas faute d'idées." [1]

The leading features of the scholastic methods are definition and distinction, the latter dominating, according to Harnack. To define precisely and to distinguish safely are always desirable; needed at every turn of life, and hence also ever called into play. They are found in every study. While this is true, they mark, however, in scholastic methods a *point d'appui*, which renders them peculiarly their earmark. That which befogs argument arises from the misunderstanding of terms, while again a great deal of discussion would be shut out by just distinctions. A priest well trained in scholastic methods has a strong armor of defense and a trenchant weapon of attack.

Surely a seminarian should put into their mastery as much mental effort and hardships, at least as law or medical students do to overcome the phraseology and obsolete roundabouts of the Bar, or the pestle and mortar.

For a just and profitable use of scholastic methods it is necessary to have opponents matched evenly in knowledge, ability, and skilfulness.

The disputant lacking in any one of these, no matter how sound his argument or how truthful his cause, is at a disadvantage. He is like a dueller without weapons, or if armed, placed beyond reach of his opponent. The thrusts, feints, parries, and strokes of fencing have their counterpart in the sophisms, fallacies, and kindred dialectic tricks of the scholastic methods. Far wiser it is to refuse to enter upon or keep up a disputation when unfairness or weakness is seen, than to face an antagonist who proves dishonest or an unequal match. When the weaker party is lacking in " fibre " and intelligence, he is hurt and anxious to win *per fas aut nefas*. He balks not at fallacies, sophisms, and even in the long run may show bad temper and ill manners. All this plays a not unimportant role towards the outcome. Hence it is not prudent to dispute with the vast bulk of men. After entering on an argument, if we observe any sign of headstrongness or anger the dispute should stop there and then.

Nowadays, however, little fervor appears in handling scholastic

[1] De Wolf, in *Revue L. R.*

methods. Our levites memorize their tasks usually, some professors even exacting the words of the text-books or of their own notes; while scarcely any professor energizes the nerveless structure of scholastic methods.

To illustrate this, we give an extract from a letter of Cardinal Vaughan to Wilfred Ward, apropos of the method of teaching followed by Ward's father when professor of dogma at Old Hall.

"I remember often wondering in Rome how it was that so little piety and unction were brought into our lectures on dogma, and complaining that the most vital and essential doctrines of the faith were treated as dryly and logically as if they were no more than so many mathematical propositions. Well, of course, the reason of this was that they were being drawn out and defined with scientific precision, after the manner of St. Thomas and the schoolmen; the theory being that the business of the professor is to deal simply with the intellect, and to furnish the minds of his students with the exact scientific knowledge, which it will be their business to turn to practical account. It was also urged, with great force, that four years were all too short for a full course in theology, and that the professors could aim at nothing beyond getting in their matter. Nevertheless, I always regretted this dry, abstract way of procedure.

"And now I had come upon Ward. His method was entirely different. With him the heart and affections were aroused by the picture of the doctrines worked out to their logical conclusions by his intellect. It was often a wonderful sight to see him at the table holding his MS. book in both hands, while there came bubbling up, pouring over, streams, torrents of exposition with application to daily life, followed by burning exhortation and reference to the future life and duties of his pupils. Sometimes his voice trembled and he shook all over, and I have seen him burst into tears when he could no longer contain his emotion. There were often strange and memorable sights; for the enthusiasm and emotion of the professor were caught up in varying degrees by many of his disciples. Ward's course of theology, with all its intellectual characteristics, were truly a course of *théologie affective*. He was more like St. Augustine or some other of the Fathers teaching and haranguing on the doctrines of the faith than like a mere intellectual schoolman."

Surely the outcome of scholastic methods in the seminary should be that a priest on entering on his career knows how to work, have methods in work, be able to think and be ready for the

manifold conditions of life, which shall meet him in his round of duties. A seminary is not a barracks, nor can it be possible to break in a houseful of seminarians like one would a company of soldiers. Great freedom of action is secured to priests, both from the prudent wisdom of bishops and the rights secured them by Canon Law.

The methods of the seminary form the man. They need make one humble, another confident, to calm this mind, to enthuse that; now to check, again to urge. No two seminarians will ever be alike in thought or power. The seminarian himself is the essential element in handling the scholastic method, which demands a sound human nature at least, and can never be built on its wreck.

It is noteworthy, moreover, that the seminary course, both in philosophy and theology, is mainly a rehearsal of authorities. Our text-books are compendiums. Little if any personal research is indulged in by the seminarian, or perhaps expected of him. He takes his author and professor at their own self-appreciation, for he knows that, as to clerical studies and priestly duties, he has only to observe external decorum and fulfil routine work; then sooner or later he will land at the head of a parish. The thoughts and dreams of seminarians gyrate around the parochial residence as a fixed centre, sure to reach it if the proprieties are observed.

While this paper touches only the skeleton of priestly education, it should not, however, be outside its scope to ask the question, "Are seminaries intended to send forth masters of scholastic methods?"

The education of seminarians involves the far more momentous question, "What sort of a man shall the priest be?" Every priest should be educated in Ruskin's meaning of the word, "Leading human souls to what is best and making what is best out of them."

Provided a priest knows his duty and is happy in doing it, we may say it is enough as a general rule. Notwithstanding, the seminary should grapple constantly with the philosophical, social, industrial, political, and educational problems of our day and country. There are many mooted questions in the daily press; moral obligation and its rationale; morals themselves—whence are they? of necessity or arbitrarily? etc., etc.

In conclusion, we must repeat that a method is necessary and that the scholastic method is in possession. Nor can professors be permitted to bandy methods at will. Outside and beyond the scholastic, however, are various other methods which we may summarize under the title "Scientific."

Now the scholastic and scientific methods are apart. While, as Brownson remarks, there is not a single important question which the schoolmen have not discussed, and well and ably discussed, still it is certain that scientific methods aim at truth. Just as scholars expect the day when in the words of Herbert Spencer there will be "a unification of knowledge," so likewise let us hope there will develop a unification of methods. Jowett calls it "Idealized Experience." In the methods of historical studies, philological, scientific, geographical, and many more, there seems to be a basic unity of observation and experience; so there remains the hope that the revelation of the sciences will, like the stars in heaven, shed their light upon one another.

At our age of the world, no system of study can be created *de novo;* every branch of knowledge spells evolution. "Tene quod habes" is a sound principle, while it is permissible to shape our language to the needs and claims of the present, thus adapting them for the future. "It becomes," adds Wilfred Ward, "a practical question how to adjust the claims of mediæval philosophy—we may say 'scholasticism'—to the claims of the methods and substance of advancing thought."[2]

The Jesuit, Kleutgen, quoted by Ward, goes further, "Scholastic philosophy"—are his words—"as a whole, is susceptible of noteworthy improvements; nay, from the circumstances of the time it needs them, in so much that in this sense it may be superseded by a better philosophy."

As St. Bernard, one hundred years before scholasticism, decried Aristotle and pagan philosophy, yet the scholastics harnessed him and it to the chariot of Truth; so one hundred years hence, science and scientific men, although now looked upon askance, may be the staunchest defenders of the Church of Christ.

J. R. SLATTERY.

Baltimore, Md.

[2] *Dublin Review.*

LUKE DELMEGE: IDIOTA.[1]

XX.—Eclectic Catholicism.

IT is quite certain that Luke Delmege regarded these four years at Aylesbury as by far the happiest of his life. Here he had everything that a fine intellect and rather refined taste could require. He had leisure for thought in the intervals of almost unintermitting work; or, rather, this ceaseless work supplied material for thought, which again interacted and created its own outcome in ceaseless work. He gave himself a day's recreation every Monday, after the great Sunday sermon. At least, he took out Pio, the great brown retriever, and spent the day in the country. One of the relics of his time is before the writer in the shape of a bamboo cane, notched and indented by Pio's teeth, where he dragged it from the river. But on these excursions by the lonely river, the ever-active mind was at work—now on the subject of the next sermon, now on the conversation the last night at the salon; again, on the many, very many societies for the general amelioration of the race, of which he was either an active or an honorary member. These included a society for the rescue of discharged prisoners, a society for the suppression of public vice, a society for the housing of the poor, a society for the purification of the stage, etc., etc.

"I don't see your name, Father Delmege," said the dry old rector, "on the committee for making statesmen truthful, and introducing the Seventh Commandment on the Stock Exchange."

Luke concluded that the old man was jealous. The old man had a good deal of temptation to become so. He was nobody. Luke overshadowed him utterly.

"You'll preach at Vespers on Sunday evening, of course, Father Delmege?"

"I should be most happy, indeed; but it is Dr. Drysdale's turn on Sunday evening."

"Oh! how unfortunate! And the Lefevrils are coming. Could you not effect an exchange?"

"I should most gladly do so; but, you know, the rector would hardly like the suggestion."

[1] *Copyrighted*, 1900, by the American Ecclesiastical Review.

"Do try, Father. It's really more important than you imagine or I can explain. I'm sure, if you knew how *very* important it is—"

"I fear it is quite impossible, Mrs. Bluett—"

"Oh, dear! The doctor is such a dear old soul, but he *is* dry. There, I've made a horrid pun; but, dear me, he is so tedious, and I shouldn't care, but of all evenings—"

No wonder Luke worked at his sermons! He sat at his desk at ten o'clock on Tuesday morning, and worked steadily to midday. By Friday evening he had written fifteen pages of a sermon. On Saturday he committed it to memory, and, without the omission or alteration of a word, he delivered it on Sunday morning, at the Gospel of the *Missa Cantata*, or at Vespers in the evening. And during these four years he never ventured to speak publicly without having made this careful and elaborate preparation. In after years he often wondered at himself, but admitted that he dared not do otherwise. He never knew who might be listening to him in this strange land, where everyone is so interested in religion, because every man is his own pope; and so uninterested, because he cares so little what all the other popes, even the archbishop of Canterbury, may hold or teach. But the discipline was good for Luke. It gave him a facility in speaking, which lasted through life.

Now, Dr. Drysdale was not jealous. He was too old, or wise, or holy, to be aught but amused, aye, indeed, and anxious about his young confrère. Amused he was, and very much amused, at the Celtic impetuosity with which Luke flung himself into every kind of work. His strenuous manner, generous, self-sacrificing, was such a contrast to his own placidity that it was quite interesting in the beginning. Then it became a matter of grave concern to the gentle old priest.

"That is a valuable and interesting book," he would say, pushing over a volume by some great Catholic author to Luke, for he was a member of St. Anselm's Society, and this was one of the societies of which Luke was not a member. "Take it to your room and read it at your leisure."

Luke would take it; but Mill, and Heine, and Emerson, had got hold of him just now, and he would bring it back uncut after

a few days, with a remark that was meant to be pregnant and suggestive:

"All the poetry of the world is in the Catholic Church; and outside, its literature."

Or: "It seems to me that the whole of our philosophy consists of junks of indigestible propositions, garnished with syllogisms of froth."

The rector would rub his chin and say: "Humph!" which is eloquent, too.

On Sunday afternoon the rector would say: "Spare me half an hour, Father Delmege, and help me at the altar!"

The "Altar" was a privileged one in this sense, that no one, not even the president of the Altar Society, was allowed to touch it for any purpose whatsoever. The arrangements of the cloths, the vases and their flowers—all were the rector's exclusive province, where no one dared interfere. But he took especial pride in the decoration of the high-altar for Sunday evening Benediction. It was a labor of love that extended over three hours of the Sunday afternoon. There were sometimes from one hundred and twenty to fifty candles to be placed ready for lighting; and the vicar had a fancy that there should be a special design for each Benediction. Then, as a final touch, he tipped the wick of each candle with a preparation of melted wax and paraffin—a chemical compound in which he took great pride; and he had serious thoughts of patenting it. That chemical and its jam-pot was a perpetual source of wonder to Luke. I fear the wonder was slightly contemptuous. To see this excellent old man, Doctor of Divinity, Dublin Reviewer, correspondent with French and Italian philosophers, studiously mixing that oil and wax, and then standing on a ladder, as he put up, and took down, and rearranged candles and flowers, was a something far beyond Luke's comprehension. In after years, when his eyes were widely opened, Luke dropped some bitter tears over that jam-pot and—himself.

"Impossible, sir!" he would explain, in reply to his vicar's invitation. "I really have something serious to do. Can't you let the ladies or the sacristan attend to these things?"

The old man would not reply, except to his unseen Master.

But Luke was happy; and his great happiness was in his dealings with converts. Here he had a broad field for learning, tact, and sympathy. To lift these trembling souls over the quagmires and shaking bogs of unbelief—to enlighten, cheer, support under all the awful intellectual and spiritual trials of incipient doubt, until he had planted them safely at his feet on the firm ground of Catholic faith and practice—to witness their almost exultant happiness, when, the final step being taken, with closed eyes and gasping breath, they at length found themselves in the home of serene security—to open up to their wondering vision all the splendors and beauties that they had hitherto seen under distorting and bewildering lights—to share in their happiness and gratitude—ah me! this is ecstasy, and Luke felt: Yes! here is my vocation; here I have found my life-work! And if ever a doubt crossed his mind about his studies at this time, he hushed the complaining voice with the dogmatic assurance:

"The first step towards conquering the enemy is to enter the enemy's arsenals and handle his weapons."

There were some drawbacks, indeed. Now and again some giddy girl, or some conceited Scripture-reader, would go through the form of conversion, and then "revert." One day a lady wished to see him. She was closely veiled. She insisted on being received into the Church then and there. Luke demurred. He took her down to the Convent of the Faithful Companions, and placed her for instruction under Reverend Mother's care. He felt quite proud. This was evidently a lady of distinction. A few days later he strolled down leisurely to ask after his convert. Reverend Mother met him with a smile.

"No; the lady had not returned. She was a lunatic, who had slipped from her mother's carriage, whilst her mother was shopping; and the bellman had been ringing the city for her since."

Luke got into a newspaper controversy. There was a very, very High-Church rector in the neighborhood. He had far more candles than the mere Romans, and his vestments cost twice as much as theirs. He reserved the Precious Blood (so he thought, poor man!), and had a special lunette made for the phial at Benediction. He gave awful penances, in imitation of the primitive Church, and always, once or twice a year, he refreshed his super-

lative orthodoxy by a furious attack on the unoffending Romanists. Some of his congregation were edified and strengthened by these violent philippics, especially a few whose relatives had passed over to Catholicity and made them "suspect;" a good many were disgusted, for, even in Ritualism, the Englishman asserts his individual freedom of thought; but most of the congregation were amused.

"He doth protest too much," they averred. "It is all on account of that dog, Pio, who has the good taste to come to our Church on Sundays."

Yes; but not to worship. Pio had the amiable habit, acquired in some mysterious manner, of trotting down to the Ritualistic church every Sunday morning, and there, posted at the gate, of scrutinizing carefully every face and figure that passed in to service.

"The Roman priests sent him," said the vicar, "to see if any of their stray sheep had wandered into the true fold."

But the vicar was mad. And the *Aylesbury Post* was just the vehicle for his insanity. Such scorn, such hatred, such cool, undiluted contempt for "his" parishioners, "these Romish priests," was only equalled by the mighty organ of the sect in London; and the fierce philippic was generally followed by an angry demand for dues or tithes from "his parishioners." The rector read the paper with a smile and put the letter in the fire. Not so Luke. Luke wore a good, broad seam of white along the fine, red carpet in his room, and a good, broad path along the tiny square of grass in front. Luke was deep in thought, and Luke's thoughts found issue in words. The excellent editor of the *Aylesbury Post* had never received such a document before, even from the High-Church vicar. Deep, cutting sarcasm, quotations from Anglican divines that would make a statue blush, refutations that were irrefutable, and logical sequences that were undeniable—and all couched in language that seemed to set the paper in a blaze! The editor read with a smile, and dropped the paper into the wastepaper basket, then looked to see if there were danger of a conflagration.

Luke went around with his burning secret for twenty-four hours. He expected to cause a sensation in the city, probably a

large secession from Ritualism,—at least, a long, fierce, angry controversy, in which he, calling on all his vast resources, would infallibly come out as victor. The second day was a day of fever and unrest. The third morning came. There was a second sarcastic letter from the High-Churchman, and just a little editorial note:

"We have also received a communication from L. D. on this interesting subject. The gentleman knows well how to use his pen. ED. *A. P.*"

As on a former occasion, Luke played Rugby football around his room, much to the amusement of his rector, who read that footnote with intelligent and comprehensive pleasure, and Luke broke forth into a hysterical soliloquy:

"Fair play! British fair play! They're the greatest humbugs and hypocrites on the face of the earth! Here is an open attack, uncalled for, without pretence of reason or exciting cause. Here is a reply, fair, temperate, judicious, and lo! it is suppressed. It is the old, old story. They talk of truth when they lie! They talk of religion when they blaspheme! They talk of humanity when they rob, and plunder, and kill! They talk of fair play when they are tying your hands to smite you!" Which shows that Luke's exuberant admiration of everything English did sometimes suffer a pretty severe frost-nipping. He never spoke to his good rector on the matter. He disburdened his conscience elsewhere.

"Nothing reminds me so much of what we read about the calm constancy and fortitude of the early Christians," said the great "Master" one of these evenings, "as the peace that seems to come down and hover over the souls of recent converts to Catholicism."

"Ah, yes, to be sure," said Amiel Lefevril; "the whole motive and genesis of Catholicism seems to be found in seeking pleasure in pain. I consider our religion higher and deeper, for that we seek pain in pleasure."

The Master smiled. His pupils were advancing in Platonism.

"This is one reason," she continued, "why I cannot embrace Roman Catholicism, attractive as it otherwise is. It seems to be

founded on selfishness. Its charity is forever seeking a guerdon, either in the esteem of others or in the exquisite sense of self-exaltation, or in the final reward of a heaven. Is it not higher and nobler and loftier to act and think for the abstract *Idea* of benefiting humanity? So with prayer. I can understand prayer as an ecstasy of thought of the Infinite; an uplifting of soul to the spheres; a conscious merging of the *Ego* in the *All*. But your everlasting whinings for mercy, your prayers against the laws of Nature, are unintelligible. And as for penance, what is it but the delight of pain—the subtle, emotional suffering that bathes the self-conscious flagellant in an ecstasy of bliss?"

"You seem, Miss Lefevril," said Luke timidly, "to overlook what lies at the bottom of all ascetic practices and prayers—the essential dogmas or truths of religion."

"Oh," said Miss Amiel, "truth? There is no such thing, except as an abstraction. Hence I always hold that we are all—that is, all good people are—practically the same. And each soul is at liberty to select its own beliefs and form an aggregate for itself."

Luke looked wonderingly at the Master, who appeared to be highly pleased with his pupil. He ventured however to protest:

"I cannot really follow you, Miss Lefevril," he said; "it seems to me a logical sequence from no truth to no principle."

"I spoke of beliefs," said Miss Amiel. "There is a natural and logical sequence between belief and principle."

"And how can there be faith without an object—and that object, Truth?" said Luke.

"Dear me! how shall I explain?" said Miss Amiel. "You know, of course—indeed, I think I have heard you say so—that mathematical proofs are the most perfect?"

Luke assented.

"That there is nothing so certain as that two straight lines cannot enclose a space?"

Luke nodded.

"And that every point in a circle is equidistant from the centre?"

"Quite so!"

"But these things do not and cannot exist, except as abstrac-

tions of the mind. There is no objective truth there, because there is no object at all. The same with all truth, for all truth is immaterial and purely subjective."

"Then you don't believe in God?" said Luke bluntly.

"Oh! dear, yes. I believe in my own concept of God, as do you!"

"Or in hell, or in a future life?" gasped Luke.

"Dear me! yes, yes, I believe in hell—the hell we create for ourselves by misdoing; and the immortality of myself, my soul, passing down through the endless ages in the immortality of my race!"

"I regret to say, Miss Lefevril, you can never become a Catholic with such ideas!"

"But I *am* a Catholic. We are all Catholics. We all have the same spirit. Mr. Halleck is a Catholic, yet not the same as you—"

"I beg pardon. Mr. Halleck is a communicant at our church and has made profession of our faith."

"Of course he has. But Mr. Halleck's subjectivity is not yours, or Mr. Drysdale's, or Mrs. Bluett's, or mine. Each soul dips into the sea and takes what it can contain. Surely, you cannot say that these poor people, who live in Primrose Lane and frequent your church, and the learned Mr. Halleck hold the same subjective beliefs?"

"So much the worse for my friend, Halleck, if that be true!" Luke had enough nerve to say.

"Not at all! He simply is an eclectic Catholic, as we all are —the Master, the Dean, Canon Merritt, even Mr. ——," mentioning the name of his High-Church friend.

Luke started back in horror.

"How can you associate the names of Mr. Halleck, the Dean, Mr. Merritt, with that—that vulgar man?"

"But, my dear Mr. Delmege, we are not now speaking of vulgarity and refinement, but of opinions—thoughts—beliefs—"

"And the whole of your beliefs is pure scepticism," said Luke.

"Not at all," smiled Miss Amiel; "you do not understand. You really must read Plato on Ideas, until you grasp the mean-

ing of Subjective Idealism, or what I have called eclectic Catholicism."

Luke began to feel that his rector was right, and that he would be more at home with old John Godfrey and his pipe. But the toils were around him, and, whilst his faith was perfect, the grace of illumination was as yet far away. He was groping in the dark vaults of what he was pleased to call "the enemy's arsenals."

Hence, too, issued a wonderful sermon which Luke preached one Sunday evening about this time. He was hardly to blame; for an idea had sprung up about this time in England that heresy was to be conquered by affecting not only a knowledge of its mysteries, but even its extravagances of language. And there was a scarcely concealed desire to attenuate the doctrines of the Church so as to fit them nicely to the irregularities of error. The idea, of course, was the exclusive property of neologists, and was regarded, not only with suspicion, but with condemnation, by older and wiser heads, who preached in season and out of season that it is not to mind and intellect that the Church looks, but to conduct and character, that is, the soul. But it is hard to convince young heads of this. So Luke had been for some time introducing into his sermons strange quotations, very like the Holy Scriptures, yet most unlike, and they were a grievous puzzle to his good rector. This evening, for the special illumination of a very large section of his audience, a number of commercial young men, who were in the habit of flocking to the Catholic church on Sunday evenings to hear this brilliant young orator, he chose for his subject the "Sacred Books." An excellent subject, excellently illustrated. But unfortunately, in the inexperienced hands of Luke, who was at this time probably penetrated by his growing love for Plato and his schools, the side scenes became more attractive than the great central picture, until at last the sermon began to descend into a mere defence of naturalism. It was all very nice and flattering to human nature, and Luke narrowly escaped an ovation when he wound up a brilliant sermon, after several quotations from the Book of Thoth, with this from another:

> "With ease he maketh strong, with equal ease
> The strong abaseth; the illustrious
> He minisheth, and him that is obscure

He raiseth up; yea more, even He, who wields
High thunders, and in mansions dwells above,
With ease makes straight the crookt, and blasts the proud.
Hear, and behold, and heed, and righteously
Make straight the way of oracles of God."

Clotilde declared the sermon magnificent.

Mary O'Reilly said to Mrs. Mulcahy:

"Did ye ever hear the like o' that? 'Tis like a sthrame of honey comin' from his mout'. It takes the ould counthry, after all, to projuce the prachers. Sure, the poor Canon, God be good to him! with his hummin' and hawin', isn't a patch on him. I suppose they won't lave him to us!"

The Canon took a different stand. He prayed earnestly, during Benediction, for light. Then, after tea, with slight nervousness, and most careful to select his words judiciously, he opened up the subject:

"Was that sermon, Father Delmege, might I ask, prepared, or was it *ex tempore?*"

Luke, who was expecting a compliment, said promptly:

"Prepared, of course. I never speak in that pulpit without committing every word of a manuscript to memory."

"I am sorry to hear it," said the old man, with some hesitation. "I was hoping that, perhaps, its indiscretions were attributable to haste and nervousness. I cannot conceive how a Catholic priest could sit down calmly and write such irrelevant and injudicious things."

Jealousy again! thought Luke. He said:

"Perhaps, sir, you would kindly explain. I am quite unconscious of having said anything indiscreet or liable to disedify."

"It is quite possible that you have not disedified," said the rector; "I'm sure I hope so. Because our own people are pretty indifferent to these very learned subjects. But do you consider the fatal effect your words might have in retarding or altogether destroying the incipient operations of grace in the souls of others?"

"You may not be aware, sir," said Luke, playing his trump card, "that these lectures are the main attraction to a rather important section of our separated brethren, who come to our church on certain evenings to hear and be instructed."

"How long have you been here, Father Delmege?" said the rector.

"Very close upon four years," said Luke.

"How many converts have you had under instruction?"

"I cannot count them," said Luke.

"How many have you received into the Church?" asked the rector.

Luke found he could easily count them on his fingers. He was abashed.

"And of these, how many have persevered?" said the old man, driving his investigations home.

Luke had to admit that nearly half had 'verted again.

"Yes!" said the old man; "and if you ask the cause, you will find it to be your too great liberalism, which to me seems to be—pardon the expression—a half apology for heathenism."

Luke was hurt.

"I'm sure," he said, "I do not know exactly where I'm standing. Our leading men glorify the learning, the research, the fairmindedness of these very men I have quoted to-night; and the very books I drew from have been favorably reviewed and warmly recommended by our leading journals. Do you want me to go back to the Catechism and to explain 'Who made the world?'"

"You might do worse," said the rector. "But, to be very serious, Father Delmege, I think the sooner you give up the company of these liberals and free-thinkers the better. I have often blamed myself for not speaking to you plainly on the matter."

"It was Mrs. Bluett introduced me to that circle," apologized Luke; "and Catholics frequent it. Halleck is always there."

"Halleck is a good fellow," said the rector; "but he has brought into the Church a little of the Englishman's indefeasible right of private judgment. If I were you, I'd give up these literary seances and look more closely after your own poor people."

"Very well, sir," said Luke. He said to his looking-glass, very soon after:

"The old story. These Englishmen want the aristocracy all to themselves."

XXI.—The Submerged Tenth.

We must not do Luke Delmege the injustice of supposing, even from his good rector's allusion, that he was altogether careless about the primary obligation of a Catholic priest—the care of the poor. Indeed, he rather prided himself on being able to pass, with equal zeal, from the drawing-room to the kitchen, and from the castle to the cabin. His figure was a familiar one to the denizens of Primrose Lane. For here congregated a small colony of exiles from Ireland and Italy; and here, into the dread monotony of English life, were introduced the picturesqueness and dramatic variety which appear to be the heritage of the Catholic races. Sometimes, indeed, Luke, with his admiration of English habits and ways, was not a little shocked at irregularities which are anathematized by the English religion. The great pagan virtues of cleanliness and thrift were steadily ignored. In their place came faith and piety, enthusiasm and idealism, that were utterly unintelligible to the prosaic neighbors around.

"A family of Hirish peddlers, sa, and a family of Hitalian horgan-grinders," was the answer of a portly dame to one of Luke's inquiries. "They are very huntidy, sa, in their 'abits."

"Thim English, yer reverence, they're haythens. They don't go to church, Mass, or meeting. They think of nothing but what they ate and drink."

Which sums up neatly the controversies between the races, with which economists have filled not only volumes, but libraries.

Luke at this time was quite flattered at being considered an Englishman; and when his country was decried, instead of flaring up in the old passionate way, he politely assented. And yet, he really loved his own people, would take a pinch of snuff from Mrs. Mulcahy, and say the *Banacht Dia*—the beautiful prayer for the Holy Souls, that is never omitted on such an occasion in Ireland. And he loved his little Italians—their strange, grotesque gestures, their beautiful liquid tongue; and he went so far as to nurse and fondle the bambinos, and to be interested even in the intricacies of the "horgan." And he did shudder a little occasionally when he had to pass through a crowd of English girls, with their white, paste faces, and when he had to undergo a bold

scrutiny from the irreverent gaze of some English laborers. In the beginning, too, he had to submit to an occasional sneer—"I confess," or "Hour Father," as a gang of young Britishers passed by; but by degrees he became known, and these insults ceased. But it was in the county prison that he became most closely acquainted with the "submerged tenth," and here he had some novel experiences.

A quick pull at the jangling bell, a courteous salute from the officer, a jingling of keys, the monastic silence of the vast hall, laced with the intricacies of iron fretwork in the staircases that led to the galleries, from which again opened up and shut the gates of the tombs of the living—nerves shrink at the thought until nerves become accustomed to the ordeal. Then, an unceremonious unlocking of cells and a drawing of bolts—an equally unceremonious slapping to of the heavy iron door, and Luke is alone with a prisoner. He is clad in brown serge, with just a loose linen muffler around his neck. His name?

"Casabianca. Is as innocent as ze babe unborned. Was in ze French navee. Quartur-mastere. Yes. Saw some foreign serveece. Has a vife. (Weeps sadly.) And leetle childrens. (Weeps loudly.) Ees a Catolique. Knows his releegion vhell. Ees starved. Eferyting is so tirty. Did noting. Vhas arresteed, he know not vhy; but he has six monz to serve."

Later on Luke found he was not quite so innocent. He gave Luke several lessons in prison life; showed him how to take out the stopcock when the water was shut off in the pipes, and through the empty pipes to establish telephonic communication with his neighbors; showed him a new telegraphic system by knocking with the knuckles on the wall; showed him divers ways of hiding away forbidden material.

Allons! The bell rings and he is ushered into another cell. Here is a stalwart Irishman, awaiting trial for having, in a fit of drunkenness, abstracted a pair of boots that were hanging outside a draper's shop.

"You'll get three months!" said Luke.

"I hope so, sir. I may get seven years' penal servitude. It's my second offence; and if they find I'm an Irishman, I shall be certainly sent to penal servitude."

"Impossible! nonsense!" said Luke.

The prisoner got seven years. His little wife from Kerry fainted. The judges laughed and joked.

Here, too, were sailors from Glasgow, and Paisley, and Liverpool, in for refusing to go to sea in water-logged vessels, and who purchased their lives with three months' starvation.

Luke was very indignant. The perfect mechanism of English methods was beginning to pull on him. It was so silent, so smooth, so deadly, so indifferent. He had a row with his rector over the matter. And at the Lefevrils he said:

"I know it is civilization; but there's something wanting. What is it?"

He expressed in emphatic language his difficulties to John Godfrey. John, usually so phlegmatic, flared up.

"The people must be protected, and what is to protect the people but the law?"

"But seven years' penal servitude for a freak in a fit of drink! Do you understand it? Can you imagine the horror, the desolation, the misery, the despair, of these seven years of hell?"

"That's all right. But the law—the law!"

The law was the fetish. You dare not whisper a syllable against it. Not the law of God, but of man.

"You, Irish," said the rector, "are by nature opposed to law and order. You sympathize with crime—"

"I beg pardon," said Luke. "We feel for criminals, we condemn crime."

"Then why commit crime?" said the rector.

"Commit crime? Ireland is the most crimeless country in the world," said Luke.

"Tell that to the marines!" said the rector. Luke didn't. He knew that on certain subjects the British mind has one of the symptoms of incurable insanity—the *idée fixée* of Charcot.

He thought it would be a nice subject for the salon. Such social problems were often debated there, and there was as much theorizing as in Parliament. He broached the matter delicately—the dreadful inequality of punishments under the English law. They gnashed their teeth. He had blasphemed their god.

"Your countrymen are curiously sympathetic with crime."

"There is more crime committed in one day, one hour, in England than would be committed in Ireland in a century," said Luke, repeating the usual formula.

"Ah! yes, perhaps so; but they are a lawless race."

"They don't break God's laws," said Luke.

"God," said Amiel, "is another name for order—*Kosmos*, as Satan is disorder—*Chaos*. It is the universal order of Nature that any deflection from its rules must inexorably meet its punishment. The English law is the interpreter of Nature, that is—God!"

Luke bowed; but he thought he heard the snarl of a wild beast somewhere. He said diffidently:

"It seems to me that Carlyle, not Christ, is the prophet of the English people."

"Christ interpreted by Carlyle," said Amiel.

"I never met His Name in Carlyle's twenty-two volumes," said Luke.

But ever after, as he watched curiously the little, shy, half-suppressed indications of affection in the families to which he was welcomed, and which revealed their inner secrets to him, he could not shake aside the thought that had fastened on his fancy of the lioness and her cubs:

"Mouthing her young in her first fierce kiss."

But this awful, unbending, retributive justice—this appeal to the brutality of nature—made him shudder, whilst it fascinated him. It was the dread grinding of the blind mechanism that was always haunting him—the voice of a soulless creation.

Luke was asked, the following Sunday, to officiate at Seathorpe, a fashionable watering-place, just then springing into eminence on the south coast. He had to travel forty miles by train, and he reached the village at dusk. He was directed to a lonely house down by a sheltered quay, and called Aboukir Mansion. Here he was met by the ubiquitous Irishman and his wife, and it was a warm greeting from hands that had dug in the silver mines at Nevada, and had held a musket in the trenches before Sebastopol. And he needed it, for it was a large, roomy mansion, bare

of furniture, except such as was absolutely necessary—just the kind of place where Dickens would locate a mysterious murder and make the walls tell of it. Next morning, at ten o'clock, he faced his congregation. It consisted of six servants, the lord of the manor, and a magnificent St. Bernard dog. The two latter were located within the sanctuary, as became their dignity. The others were without. The chapel was the old dining-room; but the altar had been once in the place of honor in a famous Capuchin convent on the Adriatic coast. Luke was about to commence Mass, when a certain figure, clothed in clerical costume, arrested his arm and said aloud, with a strong nasal accent:

"*Come, let us adore!*"

Luke was about to resent the interruption when the figure knelt and gravely intoned:

"*Come, let us exult in the Lord, let us rejoice in God our Helper; let us come before His presence with thanksgiving, and make a joyful noise to Him with psalms.*"

And the congregation muttered:

"*The King to whom all things live; come, let us adore.*"

So the superb psalm went on to the end. But Luke was nowhere. He inquired afterwards who the interloper was. A village tailor, who had been received into the Church a few weeks before.

Then came the *Missa Cantata*, sung by the choir; and at the Gospel Luke preached for thirty minutes. The old man slept; but he congratulated Luke warmly afterwards. The Irishman was in ecstasies.

"Why, you are akchally an orator, yer reverence!"

Luke admitted the impeachment.

He was to dine at the manor at eight o'clock. He held an afternoon service at five. This time there was a crowd, a curious, gaping crowd of villagers, who gathered in fear and trembling to see what the Papists were doing. Amongst them Luke noticed two ladies in black.

"They have been attending the church for ten years," said the sacristan.

"Then they are Catholics?" asked Luke.

"No! nor ever will be," was the answer.

Luke was received in the drawing-room with frigid politeness. The old man sat in his arm-chair, his dog beside him. There was an Anglican clergyman in the room and his four daughters. He was the old man's nephew and expectant heir. For the old man had married his Irish cook, who had converted him. Then she went to heaven to receive her reward. The estate was entailed

Dinner was announced. The old man looked at Luke. Luke returned the gaze calmly. The old man was disappointed. It was the duty of the chaplain to wheel him in to dinner. Luke had failed to understand, and the nephew dutifully took his place, wheeled the old man out of the drawing-room, into the corridor, right to the head of the table, the huge mastiff walking gravely by his side. Luke was allowed to say grace. In the course of the dinner the nephew touched the decanter and looked at his uncle. He was a clergyman, and in his fiftieth year.

"Might I have one, sir?"

"Yes, *one*," said the old man.

It was a beautiful act of reverence to old age, or was it—mammon?

When the ladies had retired, the three gentlemen sat around the fire. There was solemn silence. Luke was uneasy. His nervous temperament was not yet wholly subdued, although he had acquired the art of being silent for ten minutes; but a quarter of an hour was too great a strain. He addressed the old man:

"I daresay a good many yachts run in here in the summer and autumn months?"

The old man was asleep.

"Did you see Stanley's latest?" Luke said to the nephew.

"Stanley? Stanley?" coughed the clergyman. "Never heard of him."

"He has just returned from his tour through Egypt and the Holy Land. He accompanied the Prince of Wales."

"He must have had a jolly time. Franked all the way, I suppose?"

Luke saw the trend of his thoughts, poor fellow!

"I like Stanley," he said, "although he's as hard on celibate clergy as Kingsley—"

"The awful fool!" muttered the clergyman.

"But then he had his five or six thousand a year, and no children."

The poor man groaned.

"Now," continued Luke, "I always pray for two persons—the Pope that invented celibacy, and the Chinaman that invented tea."

"So do I! So do I!" said his neighbor. "That is, I don't know about that Chinaman; but I like that Pope. God bless him!"

Luke watched the fire.

"Look here," the other whispered, "'tis all rot!"

"I beg your pardon," said Luke.

"I say, 'tis all rot," repeated his companion. "'Tis all L. S. D."

"I can't quite catch the subject," said Luke, "though I understand the predicate."

"All this rubbish about religion. Why, any man can be religious on a thousand a year. Any man can be holy on two thousand a year. Any man can be a saint on five thousand a year. It's all this way. To be a saint you must be at peace with all the world. Very good. But with five thousand a year, where's the trouble? Why, man, you can't have an enemy. Who'd say boo to a fellow with five thousand a year, a palace, and a carriage? Phew!"

"I hope your excellent uncle has twice five thousand a year!" said Luke, consolingly.

But there came such a look of terror on the poor fellow's face that Luke changed the subject immediately.

"That's a magnificent St. Bernard!"

"A true blood! The monks gave him to my uncle!"

"That was kind."

"I suppose they thought St. Bernard would like it. He liked the English, you know!"

"I did not know. I'm deeply interested."

"I don't know much about these things; but I heard a clever fellow of ours say that St. Bernard gave the Pope of his day a rap over the knuckles, and that he detested the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception."

"Indeed! That must be a clever fellow," said Luke, sarcastically.

"Oh, yes! And, therefore, he must be one of us, you know."

"I see. Any one that protests?"

"Exactly. Any man that makes a row against things as they are—"

"Eh? eh?" said the old man opening his eyes.

The nephew was paralyzed. But the old man dropped asleep again.

"You were saying?—" said Luke.

"Sh! No, sir, I was not saying."

"Well, you implied that you gather everything clean and unclean into the capacious sheets of Anglicanism. I have noticed that. I remarked the other day to one of your canons that it was a singular fact that in the Revised Version of the New Testament, whereas every rationalist and free-thinker is quoted, there's not a single Catholic writer even mentioned."

"Of course not; of course not," said the nephew, who was watching his uncle anxiously.

"'Tis the tradition of your Church," said Luke, "and when the old men die—"

"Eh? eh? Who said I was dying?" exclaimed the old man, and dropped asleep again.

"For God's sake stop and look at the fire," said the alarmed nephew. "If he hears anything again 'tis all up."

"All right," said Luke.

So they watched the fire until the old man became restless again.

"What's his weak point?" whispered Luke.

"The view," whispered the nephew, in an alarmed whisper.

Luke got up and went to the window. It was a something to be proud of. As one looked down from the almost dizzy height, over the roofs of detached villas, each nestling in its own dark-green foliage, and out across the quiet village to where the sea slept, stretching its vast peacefulness to the horizon, the words leaped to the lips:

> "Charmed magic casements, opening on the foam
> Of perilous seas, in faery lands forlorn."

But it was the peace, the Sabbath peace of a Sabbath evening in England, that stole on the senses, and wrapped them out of the

bare, bald present into the music and magic of the past. And, irresistibly, Lisnalee and all its loveliness rose up before the mind of Luke. It was now an infrequent and faint picture. Luke had blotted it from his everyday memory. He had said good-by to his own land forever. After his last visit, when everything looked so old and melancholy, and every white cottage was a sepulchre, he had tacitly made up his mind that his vocation was unquestionably to remain in England, work there and die there, and he only awaited the expiration of his seven years' apprenticeship to demand an *exeat* from his own bishop and affiliation to his adopted diocese.

"Yes," he said to himself, "everything points that way. I have found my *métier*. I must not throw it aside. I have no business in Ireland. I should be lost there, and we must not bury our talents in a napkin."

But somehow, standing in this broad bay-window, this long, summer twilight, Lisnalee would project its bareness and sadness across the calm beauty and the snug prosperity of this English village. He tried to blot it out. No; there it was, floating above the real landscape, as a mist floats its transparency over a sleeping lake. And he remembered that fierce argument he had with his own conscience, as he rocked on the boat the afternoon of the great day when he said his first Mass.

"I was right," he said; "if I had remained at home, what should I be now? A poor, half-distracted professor in a seminary, or a poor, ill-dressed, ill-housed curate on the mountain, and see what I am!"

And Luke lifted his watch-chain and thought of his greatness.

"Eh? eh?" said the old man, waking up finally. "What did you say?"

"I say," said Luke, promptly, "that there is not in the world, except perhaps at Sorrento or Sebenico, a view to equal that."

"Ha! did ye hear that, George?" chuckled the old man; "did ye hear that?"

"Yes, sir," said George; "Mr. Delmege has been raving about it the whole evening."

"Mr. Delmege has excellent taste," said the old man; "here, George, the ladies await tea."

He took occasion to whisper to Luke:

"I wish the bishop would send you here. I have endowed the mission—a hundred a year. And you should dine with me every day. Eh?"

"It would be delightful," said Luke. And as he walked slowly, step by step with the yawning mastiff after the armchair of the host, he pictured to himself a home in this delightful village, with books and pen and paper, crowds of converts, a quarterly article in the *Dublin*, select society, an occasional run to the city or to Aylesbury to preach a great sermon, correspondence with the world's *literati*, then ecclesiastical honors, and beautiful, dignified age. Alas! and his Master's mind was weaving far other destinies for him; and swiftly and suddenly this vision of the priestly Sybarite vanished.

Next day the old man broached the subject again. He had set his heart on having a resident priest at Seathorpe. Luke referred him to the bishop; but he more than hinted that the project would be exceedingly agreeable to himself.

"Dear me!" he said, as he returned to Aylesbury by the morning train, "how swiftly we pass to extremes. It's a see-saw between the 'upper ten' and the 'lower five.' Which do I prefer? Hardly a fair question. But if I had not the prospect of that horrid prison before the mental landscape, and Primrose Lane, would life be the brighter? Who knows?"

He drew the subject around deftly that evening after tea. The good Canon was anxious to enter into, and guide rightly, the strange, emotional nature that was thrown into his hands. But he confessed himself at fault. He had studied every phase of Luke's character, watched every mood, and reluctantly had come to the conclusion that the fine spirit would never go far wrong, yet never reach any great height. The very instinct that forbade the former would debar the latter. And the Canon thought the time had come for a change. Luke had made some vigorous efforts to escape the thraldom of too intellectual society; but the toils were around him, and an evening at home or at one of the quiet Catholic houses was intolerably dull. Where would all this end? The Canon often asked himself the question; and asked the same question of the flowers he placed and replaced

around his Master's throne; and asked it of the white flames that sprang up around the altar; and sometimes paused in his walk, and held his Breviary open without reading it, and stumbled at certain verses:

"*Homo, cum in honore esset, non intellexit.*"

"Does that apply to my young friend?"

"*Decidant a cogitationibus suis; secundum multitudinem impietatum eorum, expelle eos; quoniam irritaverunt te, Domine.*"

"Dear me! dear me! God forbid!"

"How did you like Seathorpe?" he said to Luke at supper.

"Very much, indeed! What a quaint old place the mansion is; and what a quaint old fellow the proprietor!"

"Yes! The Church is not making much headway there," said the old Canon.

"It needs a resident priest," said Luke, "one who would give all time and attention to the possibilities of the place."

"Yes! It would be a nice mission for a young man of energy who could keep his head."

"I don't think there's much to tempt a man to insane things there," said Luke.

"Except the worst danger—loneliness and the *taedium vitae*."

"Yes; but if a man has his books, and his pen, and his work cut out for him—"

"Quite so, if he is a strong man. But if he be a weak man, it is certain danger."

"Solitude has always been the mother-country of the strong and the elect."

"Just what I have been saying," said the Canon. "A mother-country to the strong; a howling and dangerous desert to the weak."

Luke thought that there was an undercurrent of meaning in the Canon's words; but there was nothing to catch hold of or resent.

"I shouldn't object to a mission there," he said bluntly.

"Ah! I see you're tired of us here. Well, who knows? Meanwhile, you would do well to visit the prison to-morrow. Tuesday is your day, I believe."

"Yes," said Luke. "Nothing has turned up there?"

"Nothing unusual," said the Canon quietly. "There is a soldier, a countryman of yours, up for shooting his officer through the heart on the barrack-square at Dover."

Luke studied the gas-jet for a long time when the Canon had gone to his room.

[To be continued.]

TWO RECENT WORKS ON ETHICS.

MORALPHILOSOPHIE. Eine wissenschaftliche Darlegung der sittlichen, einschliesslich der rechtlichen Ordnung, von Victor Cathrein, S.J. Dritte, verbesserte und vermehrte Auflage. B. I-II. St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder.

INSTITUTIONES JURIS NATURALIS, seu Philosophiae Moralis Universae, secundum principia S. Thomae Aquinatis, ad usum scholarum adornavit Theodorus Meyer, S.J. Vol. I-II. St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder.

ONE will incur no mark of exaggeration or of fulsome praise by saying that since the publication of Taparelli's classical *Saggio*, sixty years ago, there has been made no contribution to the literature of ethics so noteworthy as Cathrein's *Moralphilosophie* or Meyer's *Institutiones Juris Naturalis*. In view of this fact, it cannot be out of place to call the special attention of readers of the REVIEW to these two works.

The confidence the student will give to a writer in so complex and difficult a subject as moral philosophy should be based on the evidence of depth of insight, aptness of method, comprehensiveness of matter, and lucidity of exposition, manifested in the writer's work. Taking this viewpoint, the student of ethics will make no mistake in looking to these two masters for guidance and suggestion.

A little study of both authors gives one the assurance that they have gone to the first and last principles of their subject; that they have studied, not simply the science, but the philosophy of morality. It was considered a mark of Mr. Herbert Spencer's philosophical insight when, in writing the *Data of Ethics*, he sought in types and varieties of conduct in the animal world a basis for the science of morality. If this pushing of morality to a cause

deeper than man's nature be an indication of philosophical analysis, a far larger and more striking exhibition of such power is presented by Fathers Cathrein and Meyer; for both these writers find the basis of ethics in principles far deeper and wider than those which the phenomena of mere animal activity can furnish, viz., in the constitution of the very elements of which the totality of things is made up, in the ultimate constitution of nature itself, in the activity of mineral and plant, as well as in animal and in man, on his physical and on his psychical side. No one has searched so deeply for the basis of ethics in the very heart of universal nature as the illustrious Italian professor Taparelli, unless, indeed, we except the master, the elder Italian, to whom the author of the great *Saggio di Diritto Naturale* owed so much—St. Thomas Aquinas. In Father Meyer's *Institutiones*, one finds these principles drawn out and explained in some twenty-five so-called axioms. In these propositions is summarized the analysis of natural activity in general, as it emerges from the constitution of whatsoever subject, and makes for the end and purpose prefixed to it by its Maker for the tendency of its essence. The relation of action to the various energies immediately concerned in its production; the influence of object on the end, or what is the same, the good, in eliciting the energy or faculty to put forth the action; the norm whereby the rectitude of natural activity is governed and judged—in these phases of universal activity or "conduct," Father Meyer seeks for ontological, or one might better say, cosmological principles, on which to rest the superstructure of moral philosophy. It will be seen, therefore, that his ultimate principles lie deeper than psychology or biology. In the formulation and explication of these principles, the informed student will of course recognize the author's debt to Taparelli; but they lose none of their depth or force in being transplanted from their original setting into the stately form of the Latin. Father Cathrein has not, like Father Meyer, explicitly formulated these ultimate philosophical principles at the threshold of his work; but one cannot fail to notice their all-pervading influence, and not far within the precincts of his work they are seen more in their organic form and vital relations.

What one welcomes almost at the introduction to the *Moral-*

philosophie is the author's exposition of the method of ethics. The main sources of ethical science are, as he says, "the certain principles of reason." That there are universally valid, self-evident principles which every mind spontaneously forms by abstraction from sensile data is attested by universal experience. There is no man, except the arbitrary builder of dream systems, who does not recognize that the whole is greater than any of its parts; that no thing can be and at the same time and in the same respect not be; that an effect presupposes a cause; that two and two cannot be five, etc. These principles are not indeed innate; they are based on ideas abstracted from the data furnished by the senses. But given these ideas the mind spontaneously by comparison forms the general principles or judgments, and from these advances to their implied conclusions.

Here would have been the place, one might suppose, for Father Cathrein to have unfolded some at least of the intuitive principles underlying ethics. Instead, however, of so doing he advances to the empirical basis of the science and leaves the student to abstract and formulate the principles from their complex setting in the tissue of the science as the author develops it. This is the one lacuna, if such it be, that has come to the present writer's notice.

Besides the rational principles, *experience* and *history* are no less important sources of moral philosophy. Experience of oneself and our fellow men furnishes a fuller knowledge of human nature, its needs and conditions, its bearings on self and on the rest of creation, and its final destiny. Experience, therefore, has to put before the moral philosopher the concrete life and doings of men, both individual and collective, so as to enable the mind to determine the norms of conduct that are applicable to men in their actual concrete existence, and not simply in the abstract or ideal order. And here it is that history comes in to broaden the data of present experience, by reviving for us the thought and modes of action of past generations. Having shown the necessity of drawing ethics both from the intuitive principles of reason and the data of experience, Father Cathrein goes on to indicate how various system builders have fallen into lamentable mistakes because of their either exaggerating or attenuating one or other

of these sources. Rousseau, for instance, built up an elaborate system of social ethics on a purely arbitrary and abstract view of human nature. Every one knows that the man of the *Contrat Social* is not the man either of present-day experience or of past history. Kant's Ethics founded on an *a priori* analytic of reason is, if less fantastic, no more objective than the system of Rousseau.

On the other hand, De Lamenais, in his appeal to tradition as the organ of the primeval revelation for our fund of assured moral and religious truth, sets aside the ultimate criterion whereby we can discover both God and His revelation, viz., reason and its principles, and thus implicitly places scepticism at the root of ethics. Positivism especially in its recent phase of evolutionism denies or ignores the objective validity of rational principles and regards all things, reason and its intuitions included, as caught in a continual flux and change. It thus arbitrarily annihilates the immutable and consequently scientific character of ethical principles and substitutes therefore a mere temporizing description of an ever-changing morality.

Truth as well as safety lies here, as generally, in the middle. The ethical intuitions of reason and the contributions of experience, present and past, must join hands in building a system of morals. Each must do its share; neither should do too much or too little. *In medio virtus et veritas.*

Father Cathrein puts into practice this sane teaching throughout. He starts at once from a study of human nature and conduct on their physical side. Experience furnishes the data for a study of man as a microcosm, as a person, as social, as free. Freedom of will, however, is limited in its range of objects and domain, and is variously modified in intensity by environing passions. At this stage of the author's work the empirical elements are seen to advantage. A much larger contribution, however, from this source is exhibited in the appendix to the first volume, where past history is shown as enlarging present experience. A full hundred pages are given to a description of moral notions found prevailing amongst the chief nations and races, civilized and barbarian. The ancient East and West in their various ethnic groups, as well as the savage of the South Sea Islands, of the heart of Africa, and the American aborigines are brought *seriatim*

to attest their convictions regarding the right and the wrong, and the "ought" in the conduct of life, and to illustrate in how far the thesis is true that principles of morality cannot be invincibly ignored or intrinsically changed.

Whilst the author of the *Moralphilosophie* strongly asserts theoretically and illustrates practically the place of reason and of experience in ethics, the author of the *Institutiones* is no less pronounced. The *principia rationis* he declares to be the source of ethical science. What these principles are he points out somewhat in detail, as was said above. Experience and history are necessary auxiliaries. For unless in the science of morals, and especially of social right, "*saeculorum historia et praesentis temporis auctoritas* are constantly held in view, it may easily come to pass that time and energy be spent on useless rather than useful and necessary questions, or that general principles be set up, which, however true and certain *in se*, may be falsely and wrongly applied to things in the concrete" (p. xiii). That the primary source of ethics is allowed its full flow by Father Meyer, goes without saying. Abundant instances of his drawing on the subsidiary source might be cited, especially from such portions of his work as those which deal with the various theories on the norm of morality, and the subject of socialism.

Not only are these two works happy illustrations of philosophical insight and method, but their comprehensiveness of material is no less a title of merit. The traditional structure of moral philosophy is shown up by both authors, it is needless to say, in all its strength and splendid proportions, but at the same time in its relations to the special moral problems of the present age. Subjects, for instance, like contemporary socialism, the labor question, the State and education, receive the careful handling which their timeliness demands. Many of our readers who perchance are not familiar with German are doubtless acquainted in its English dress with Father Cathrein's little work on socialism, which is simply a chapter from the *Moralphilosophie* that has found its way into the principal modern languages.

A word on the last claim for recognition on the part of these works—the general form of presentation. The author of the *Moralphilosophie* has had in mind the needs and tastes both of

professional students of ethics and the general reader. Whilst therefore he exhibits the solidity and exactness characteristic of scholastic ethics, he has rounded off its roughness and given it a more attractive form. The bone and sinew of syllogisms are there, but the glove is softer than that which one expects to meet with at the hand of those representing didactic science. Somewhat the same, though in a lesser degree, may be said of the *Institutiones*. The work is essentially didactic, and appears therefore in rigid form. It is defensive and aggressive, and stands out in linked mail. At the same time the author has smoothed away the rougher phrasing of the school, and adopted the more melodious strain of a purer Latinity. Whether or not this forsaking of the easy, simple style of the schoolmen be to the advantage of clearness may be questioned; but as the *Cursus Lacensis*, of which the work is a section, may reach a somewhat different grade of readers from those for whom such works are generally intended, it may well be that a more polished Latinity is desirable. A few further details of these and some kindred works will be found in the *Book Review* of the present number.

F. P. SIEGFRIED.

Overbrook, Pa.

Analecta.

E S. CONGREGATIONE CONCILII.

DECRETUM QUO SUSPENSIO STATUITUR, ILLICO INCURRENDA A QUOLIBET DE CLERO, QUI INTESTINIS BELLIS ET POLITICIS CONTENTIONIBUS OPEM UTCUMQUE FERAT.

In perturbationibus et intestinis bellis, quibus aliquoties civiles status exagitantur, ultimis hisce annis interdum accidit, ut ecclesiastici viri, partium studio abrepti, uni vel alteri politicae factioni ultro se manciparent, et pro ea contra canonicas leges plura agere et moliri non vererentur, fidentes absolutionem in posterum se facile consequuturos.

Tam gravi malo occurrere cupiens SSmus Dominus Noster Leo PP. XIII, inhaerendo dispositionibus SS. Concilii Tridentini *sess. xiv in prooem. et cap iv*, nec non *sess. xxii cap i de reform.*, et prae oculis habita doctrina Benedicti XIV in *Instit. 101*, per praesentes S. C. Concilii litteras statuit atque decernit, ut in posterum quisquis ex clero, ut intestinis bellis et politicis contentionibus opem utcumque ferat, proprium residentiae locum absque iusta causa, quae a legitima ecclesiastica auctoritate recongita sit,

deseruerit, vel clericales vestes exuerit, quamvis arma non sumpserit, et humanum sanguinem minime fuderit; et eo magis qui in civili bello sponte sua nomen militiae dederit, aut bellicas actiones quomodocumque dirigere praesumpserit, etsi ecclesiasticum habitum retinere pergat; ab ordinum et graduum exercitio, et a quolibet ecclesiastico officio et beneficio suspensus illico et ipso facto maneat; et inhabilis praeterea fiat ad quaelibet officia aut beneficia ecclesiastica in posterum assequenda, donec ab Apostolica Sede restitutus non fuerit, sublata ad hunc effectum respectivis Dioecesium Ordinariis qualibet dispensandi potestate, etiamsi amplissimis, sive solitis (ut vocant) sive extraordinariis facultatibus rehabilitandi clericos gaudeant: contrariis quibuscumque minime obstantibus.

Datum Romae e S. C. Concilii die 12 Julii 1900.

A. *Card.* Di Pietro, *Praef.*

B. *Archiep.* Nazianzenus, *Pro-Secr.*

E S. CONGREGATIONE DE PROPAGANDA FIDE.

Romae, d. 16 Aug. 1900.

Illme et Revme Domine:

A Revmo Archiepiscopo Neo-Eboracensi, dum nuper Romae versaretur, variae petitiones amplitudinis Tuae huic S. Congregationi de Propaganda Fide exhibitae sunt, quibus nunc per has meas litteras respondere aggredior.

In primis quoad petitionem facultatis cantandi Missam solemnem votivam de SS. Eucharistia etiam occurrenti officio duplici 2dae classis transmitto amplitudini Tuae Rescriptum Sacrae Rituum Congregationis cui supradicta petitio, prout de jure, remissa fuit. Huic eidem S. Congregationi remissae sunt duae aliae petitiones circa Beatificationem Ven. Servi Dei Joannis Nepomuceni Neumann Episcopi Philadelphiensis et P. Juliani Eymard Fundatoris Congregationis SS. Sacramenti et Associationis Presbyterorum Adoratorum.

Quoad vero alias petitiones quibus Indulgentiae postulantur pro adoratoribus SS. Sacramenti sive clericis sive laicis, cum Sanctitati Suae non placeat decurrente hoc anno Jubilaei indulgentias

concedere, de illis petitionibus elapso jubilaei anno ratio habebitur. Id vero non impedit quominus Eucharisticae Sodalitates, sive inter clericos sive inter laicos, sicut jam in aliquibus Americae dioecesibus factum est, erigantur.

S. Congregatio valde gavisa est de notitia ei exhibita alterius Eucharistici Congressus anno proxime futuro habendi in urbe Sti. Ludovici et maxime laetabitur de opportunis mediis, quae in eadem adoptabuntur sive ad SS. Eucharistiae cultum augendum tum inter clericos tum inter fideles, sive ad majorem S. Communionis frequentiam promovendam.

Interea vero Sanctitas Sua, quae de his omnibus certior facta est, Apostolicam Benedictionem impertitur tum iis qui Sodalitatibus Eucharisticis in iis Foederatis Statibus nomen dederunt, tum iis omnibus qui in futuro Congressu Eucharistico partem habebunt.

Post haec omnia fausta ac felicia Tibi a Domino precor.

Amplitudinis Tuae, Addictissimus Servus

pro Emo. Card. Praefecto,

ALOISIUS VECCIA, *Secrius*,

Pro R. P. D. Seco. C. Laurenti.

Illmo et Revmo Dno Camillo Maes, Epo Covington.

RESCRIPTUM.

Moderator Generalis Sodalitatis Presbyterorum pro adoratione Smae. Eucharistiae in Foederatis Statibus Americae, communibus eorumdem votis obsecundans, Sanctissimum Dominum Nostrum Leonem Papam XIII humilibus precibus rogavit, ut occasione Coetuum eucharisticorum ad quos ex omnibus Americae Septentrionalis regionibus sacri Antistites sacerdotesque convenire solent, unam missam solemnem, votivam de sanctissima Eucharistia fas sit cantare, etiamsi officium duplex secundae classis occurrerit. Sacra porro Rituum Congregatio, utendo facultatibus sibi specialiter ab eodem SSmo. Dno. Nostra tributis, attento praesertim commendationis officio Rmi. Dni. Episcopi Covingtonensis, memoratis coetibus Praefecti, benigne precibus annuit; dummodo non occurrat duplex primae classis aut aliquod festum Domini: Servatis Rubricis. Contrariis non obstantibus quibuscumque. Die 27 Junii, 1900.

L. † S.

CAJ. *Card.* ALOISI MASELLA, *Pro-Praef.*

D. PANICI *Archiep.* LAODICEN., *Secr.*

E S. RITUUM CONGREGATIONE.

SPECIALE PRIVILEGIUM ANTICIPANDI MATUTINUM ET LAUDES.

Beatissime Pater:

Moderator Generalis pro tempore Confraternitatis Sacerdotum Adoratorum ad pedes S. V. provolutus, humillime implorat prorogationem facultatis ut Sacerdotes sodales Matutinum et Laudes ab hora prima pomeridiana recitare queant.

Et Deus, etc.

Congregationis Sanctissimi Sacramenti.

Sacra Rituum Congregatio, utendo facultatibus sibi specialiter a Sanctissimo Domino Nostro Leone Papa XIII tributis, benigne indulsit ut singuli suprascriptae Confraternitatis Alumni, ad proximum triennium, privatam Matutini cum Laudibus recitationem ab hora prima post meridiem pridie anticipare valeant.

Contrariis non obstantibus quibuscumque. Die 27 Maii 1900.

L.† S. CAJ. *Card.* ALOISI MASELLA, *Pro-Praef.*
D. PANICI *Archiep.* LAODICEN., *Secret.*

Conferences.

THE AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW proposes to answer in this department questions of general (not merely local or personal) interest to the Clergy. Questions suitable for publication, when addressed to the editor, receive attention in due turn, but in no case do we pledge ourselves to reply to all queries, either in print or by letter.

OUR ANALECTA.

The Roman documents for the month are:

I.—S. CONGREGATION OF THE COUNCIL issues decree of suspension, *ipso facto* incurred by priests who take part in political and military conflicts, and who for that purpose leave their clerical charge, even though they retain their priestly habit.

II.—S. CONGREGATION OF THE PROPAGANDA addresses a letter and rescript of the S. Congregation of Rites to the Right Rev. Bishop of Covington authorizing the celebration of one solemn votive Mass *de SS. Sacramento* on occasion of the Eucharistic Congress of the Clergy in the United States, provided it do not occur on a double of the first class or on any feast of our Lord.

III.—S. CONGREGATION OF RITES grants to priests who are members of the Eucharistic League the privilege (for three years) of anticipating Matins and Lauds for the following day at one o'clock P.M.

A NEW VERSION OF THE "IMITATIO" OF THOMAS À KEMPIS.

The Oxford University Press announces an early republication of the original Latin text of the "Imitation of Christ," in which special care will be taken to adhere closely to the terms and phraseology used by the saintly Canon Regular of Agnetenberg. Presumably the editors of the work will follow the reading of the earlier manuscripts, the first of which bearing a definite date is that of Wolfenbüttel, A. D. 1424, although there are indications that some of the existing codices from the hand of the monk Thomas Hemerken go back a few years further.

In the meantime an interesting departure has been made in the line of republishing the *Imitatio.* This comes to us in the form of a newly Latinized version, doing away with the quaint Germanisms (and Hebraisms) which bear witness to the country, character, and aim of the author of the *Imitatio.* Mr. Ferdinand Philips, a Catholic gentleman whose energetic efforts in behalf of the culture and propagation of the Latin language as a superior medium of universal thought have made themselves felt in non-professional circles, has just completed the publication (for private circulation, we understand) of a translation in which, without detriment to the sense intended by the author, the beautiful sentiments and teachings of the *Imitatio* are reproduced in elegant Latin. The work is the result of the combined efforts of three competent persons, who had due regard to the meaning and form of the original. This, as it stands, with the final corrections of the first edition published tentatively in the *Praeco Latinus*, must command recognition from the scholarly as well as the spiritual point of view.

That it would be easy to cavil about details of expression, when we come to sound what might be called the psychological accuracy of such a version, is plain. But this is true of any similar work, not excepting the approved versions of the Sacred Scripture, which make no pretence to modelling their language upon the classical standard recognized in other departments, albeit they are intended to be good reproductions of truest thought.

Setting aside such pedantry, however, there is likely to be a decided diversity of opinion as to the merits of a version made upon classical models of Latinity when such books as the Imitation or the Sacred Scripture are in question. This need not surprise us, since those who, during four centuries, have been in the habit of reading Thomas à Kempis, were, as a rule, persons who, despite superior culture which made them capable of relishing the classics of the Augustan age, could nevertheless equally appreciate the simplicity of the devout monk, and rather liked his unpolished language, just as we like the talk of children when they tell us things which in the mouth of a rhetorician might be expressed in more elegant phrase.

This simplicity, which is the artless directness of truth, constitutes one of the charms of the old Bible, and makes a "revision" of the Book of Books, despite the scholarship which vouches for its superiority, unacceptable to many persons who require correct form and grammar in any other book of standard value. The "Imitation" comes next to the Bible in the common estimate as a help to devout living, and hence it has been of all books the most frequently printed since the days of Guttenberg. But we know of no attempt to reform its somewhat barbarous Latinity; and hence the first impulse when we consider such an attempt is one of protest. We feel like a parent who is told that the plump little face of her child might be vastly improved by massage, which can shape the pretty but unæsthetic snub nose of her darling into classical Greek or Roman curves. Most mothers would prefer nature's style, without offence to the recognized models of the sculptor's art.

Yet, though this preference, which is really based on an appreciation of a subtle element of truthfulness and simplicity, must be recognized as a healthy attribute of intelligence, it is by no means clear that a beautiful thought may not be vastly improved by being beautifully expressed; for whilst it is a generally accepted axiom that the true and the good and the beautiful are identical, it does not follow that one expression of truth may not imply more goodness or beauty than another. And many sayings of the devout Thomas à Kempis, if expressed in more elegant language than he himself used, might find favor with persons who are not particularly attracted by the language which commends truth in the quaint simplicity of the mediæval forms of speech. In fact there are many expressions in the writings of Thomas à Kempis which, like the literal translations from the sacred writers, have no meaning or convey a wrong meaning to those not particularly versed in the religious and popular thought of the writer's time. It is quite true that the exact understanding of each word or phrase may not be essential to the intelligence of the main lesson to be conveyed; but as the book was written for the purpose of expressing definite or helpful thoughts, we can only welcome their proper interpretation.

Judged in this light, the work which the *Pracco Latinus* has

fostered with commendable zeal and intelligence deserves attention and support, not as if it were intended to supplant the reading of the time-honored text whose defects most of us are willing to ignore, but because it supplies a splendid medium of sound moral reading in Latin. Our young students need not be supposed to derive less knowledge of classical Latin by reading and memorizing from a faultless version of the *Imitatio* than by translating Cæsar or Sallust, and they would vastly improve their minds in other ways by the study of Thomas à Kempis.

SUPPLYING A NUPTIAL MASS.

Qu. 1. Mr. and Mrs. H—— were a short time since received into the Church. Both were previously unbaptized. Their marriage had been witnessed ten years ago by a Methodist minister. Would it not be proper for me to appoint a day, with their concurrence, for them to come to the church and assist at a Mass *pro Sponso et Sponsa*, at which I would give the blessings prescribed in the Missal?

2. Mr. and Mrs. A——, Catholics both, were married two or three months since by their pastor at "high-noon." They have taken up their residence in my parish. I would like to know whether or not I might say for them also the Mass *pro Sponso et Sponsa*, and impart the nuptial blessing.

3. Finally, what ceremonies, if any, are prescribed for the silver or golden jubilees of marriages?

Resp. 1. If the parties are desirous of having the nuptial celebration, there is nothing to prevent them from doing so. But as they are validly married and presumably enjoy, since their baptism in the Catholic Church, the sacramental graces of the married state, it would be ill-advised to expose them or their friends to the danger of suspecting that their union up to the time of their baptism was not a legitimate and valid marriage in the eyes of God and therefore of the Church. When the Ritual insists on having the ceremonies of the sacramental rites supplied, it contemplates cases in which it is perfectly obvious that the omission of the proper ceremonial at the time was the result either of expediency or of conscious neglect. In the present case neither condition seems to exist. But of course the married parties have

the right to judge for themselves, and if they wish to have the nuptial Mass, ten years after their marriage, they are still likely to benefit by it.

2. To have a nuptial Mass by way of supplying the nuptial blessing in the case of Catholics who neglected to procure that blessing at the time of their marriage at "high-noon," is a public confession of their neglect; and it may incidentally be a public censure of the methods of the neighboring pastor who married them. Hence, a priest, however laudably zealous, could hardly urge such a course without seeming to be influenced by the mere desire for stipend. But if the married couple ask for such a Mass of their own accord, there is nothing to hinder its being said for them.

3. Local rituals, sanctioned by the Holy See, and liturgists like Wapelhorst, give the following form for the celebration of silver and golden nuptial jubilees, though such form is nowhere prescribed.

The priest, vested in surplice and white stole, or, if a Mass is to be celebrated, with chasuble (leaving the maniple on the altar until Mass begins), receives the happy pair at the foot of the altar or at the communion-rail. There he makes a brief address, exhorting them to gratitude for the blessings of their state and to the renewal of their mutual compact of fidelity to the end of life Then, bidding them join hands, he blesses them, saying:

"Benedictio Dei omnipotentis, Patris †, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti, descendat super vos et maneat semper. Amen.

Ant. Ecce sic benedicetur homo, qui timet Dominum.

Psalmus CXXVII. Beati omnes, qui timent Dominum, qui ambulant in viis ejus.

Labores manuum tuarum quia manducabis, beatus es, et bene tibi erit.

Uxor tua, sicut vitis abundans, in lateribus domus tuae.

Filii tui sicut novellae olivarum, in circuitu mensae tuae.

Ecce, sic benedicetur homo, qui timet Dominum.

Benedicat tibi Dominus ex Sion; et videas bona Jerusalem, omnibus diebus vitae tuae, et videas filios filiorum tuorum, pacem super Israel. Gloria Patri, etc.

Ant. Ecce sic benedicetur homo, qui timet Dominum.

V. Domine exaudi, etc. *R.* Et clamor meus, etc.

V. Dominus vobiscum. *R.* Et cum spiritu tuo.

OREMUS.

Omnipotens sempiterne Deus, respice propitius super hos famulos tuos, ad templum sanctum tuum pro gratiarum actione laetos accedentes, et praesta, ut post hanc vitam ad aeternae beatitudinis gaudia (cum prole sua) pervenire mereantur. Per Christum, etc."

After this oration the priest sprinkles them with holy water. Here follows the Mass of the day, or, if the rubrics permit a votive Mass, *de Beata Virgine*. The celebration may end with the *Te Deum* and the versicle and oration *pro gratiarum actione*.

VOTIVE MASSES OF THE HOLY GHOST.

Qu. In many colleges and seminaries it is customary to open the scholastic year with a solemn votive Mass in honor of the Holy Ghost. Is it permitted to sing the *Gloria* and *Credo* in such a votive Mass? May such a votive High Mass be celebrated within an octave?

Resp. If the celebration of the said Mass has the authorization of the Ordinary, it is chanted with *Gloria* and *Credo*, with *one* oration (as on double feasts), and on any day except dupl. fest. I cl., dominic. I cl., Ash Wednesday and Holy Week, Vigils of Christmas and Pentecost. Hence it may be celebrated within any octave.

But if it has not the special sanction of the Ordinary (as a *missa solemnis pro re gravi ex Ordinarii indictione*), it enjoys no privilege over any other private votive Mass, and is said or chanted without *Gloria* and *Credo*.

THE BRIDAL COUPLE IN THE SANCTUARY.

Qu. Are the bridal couple, on occasion of their marriage ceremony, permitted to remain in the sanctuary? Do they receive Communion at the altar?

Resp. The rubrics of the *Missa pro Sponso et Sponsa* speak of the bridal couple as kneeling *ante altare*, that is within the sanctuary; hence there can be nothing repugnant in the idea of having priedieus in the sanctuary for them, as is the practice in many churches. The Ritual, moreover, expressly sanctions honorable

usage of any kind in the celebration of matrimony. We have repeatedly discussed the subject in previous numbers of the REVIEW to show the lawfulness of the custom.

THE CONDITION "CORDE SALTEM CONTRITO" FOR GAINING INDULGENCES.

Qu. In the REVIEW of last month, I noticed (p. 296) a grant of indulgences to the Confraternity of St. Gabriel. For the gaining of certain partial indulgences, the condition "corde saltem contrito" was expressed. This is interpreted by theologians to mean simply "in a state of grace," and is not, indeed, a *condition* so much as a *prerequisite* for the gaining of *any* indulgence "for the living." For the gaining of certain plenary indulgences specified in the Brief, on the other hand, "corde saltem contrito" was omitted; neither was Confession or Communion specified as a "condition." This fact leads me to ask whether or not either or both of these acts (Confession, Communion) be requisite? Or may the Brief be accepted to mean just what it says, without any *subintellectum?* Some friends have said to me that Confession and Communion are to be *understood* as "conditions." But some ten or eleven authorities consulted imply unanimously that the exact wording of such a Brief is to be followed. As, nevertheless, the grant of a plenary indulgence usually specifies such "conditions," I am led to wonder if, by some accident, they were not omitted in the copy of the Brief, or, mayhap, similarly by an accident in the original draft thereof? Will the REVIEW kindly help me to a decision?

Resp. A prerequisite for gaining indulgences is the state of sanctifying grace. That state implies freedom from actual mortal sin. God remits the temporal penalty due to past sin in proportion to our aversion from sin, and as it is expressed by the terms of indulgence granted in His name and power.

Since a plenary indulgence literally means a full remission of the temporal penalty due to sin, it requires necessarily a complete turning away of the affections from all sin, venial as well as mortal. Such a disposition implies much more than is expressed by the phrase *corde saltem contrito;* it supposes a heart *eminently* contrite, and in a state of complete detachment even from a clinging to venial sin. It is plain, therefore, why the phrase *corde*

saltem contrito would be omitted in the form granting a plenary indulgence. Nor is Confession and the reception of Holy Communion always made a condition for the gaining of a plenary indulgence; although we find it generally prescribed, because Communion itself, according to the teaching of theologians, effects in the soul *ex opere operato* that charity which destroys venial sin, and thus places the recipient in a proper condition of obtaining the entire virtue of the indulgence. (*Cf.* S. Alphons. *Praxis Confessarii*, n. 154.)

Accordingly, the Brief as it reads appears to us to require no special modification to interpret the terms of its concession. The omission simply facilitates the gaining of a plenary indulgence, no doubt intentionally, out of consideration for the nature of the association and its charitable work toward the sick.

PIOUS HUMBUGS.

The following, from *Catholic Book Notes*, an English publication, seems timely for our country also:

> Attention has been drawn in the *Tablet* and elsewhere to certain clerical advertisements, especially those connected with the "miraculous brief" of St. Anthony, which, to the scandal of many, have for some time been appearing in English and Irish Catholic newspapers. We are glad to learn from the *Tablet* what that paper styles "the welcome news that the Holy See has definitely refused to sanction" the class of advertisement in question, and that the answer to the appeal to Rome is "wholly unfavorable to the grovelling ecclesiastical advertisements which have caused so much pain and shame."

The "making merchandise" of the Mass has been frequently reprobated by the Holy See.[1] The Second and Third Plenary Councils of Baltimore followed the Pope in this question,[2] condemning such practice in the strongest terms.

The same principles on which that condemnation was based apply to all sacred things; for instance, to exploiting St. Anthony's Bread, even when the "bread" is given to the poor; to traffic in alleged St. Anthony's Water, "good for rheumatism, 10 cents a bottle;" *blessed* medals, whether of St. Benedict, or St. Joseph, or whosesoever, the medal costing one-tenth of a cent, and the balance of the 25 cents being asked for the blessing. All these practices are simoniacal and

[1] *Acta S. Sedis*, apud Sabetti, *Comp. Theol. Mor.*, ed. 1897.
[2] II. Plen. Council, § 370; II. Plen. Council, § 296.

condemned, no matter what pious projects are to be aided by the money so raised. The means are not justified by the end. Abuses of this nature had much to do with the Reformation; and if it reformed only them and others akin to them, it were indeed a blessing to the Church.

This letter is called forth by a circular enclosing a medal said to have been blessed by a Redemptorist Father at Ste Anne de Beaupré, for which we are asked to send the names of "three good charitable persons," and also 25 cents. We are convinced that it is far better for the spiritual and temporal weal of the pastor seeking aid, and of his people, that we refuse the money.

EDWARD MCSWEENY.

Mount St. Mary's, Maryland.

MASS STIPENDS FOR ALL SOULS' DAY.

Qu. May a priest solicit offerings for Masses for the dead on All Souls' Day, and accept an indefinite number of stipends with the understanding that he discharges his obligation in conscience by saying one Mass on All Souls' Day for the intentions of all those who make the offering? There is some misunderstanding on the subject. Some priests say one Mass and retain all the offerings of All Souls' Day as the stipend belonging to that Mass. Other priests hold themselves bound to say as many Masses during the course of the year as are represented by the amount of the offerings according to the ordinary stipend.

Resp. The above question has been repeatedly answered, and discussed in past volumes of the REVIEW.

In a letter of the S. Congregation addressed to the American Bishops[1] the Holy See, after mature deliberation and inquiry into the actual practice in the United States, laid down the following principles:

1. A priest cannot, under any circumstances, satisfy his promise to celebrate Mass in return for several stipends by saying only one Mass, unless the persons who offer the stipend are made clearly to understand that there will be no separate Mass for each intention. In such a case their offering is considered in the nature of a voluntary alms made to the priest.

[1] January 27, 1877; *cf.* AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW, Vol. VIII, pp. 63, 64.

2. In order that there may be no doubt about the interpretation of this regulation, which is in conformity with the ecclesiastical canons forbidding simony and abuse of the sacred mysteries for the purpose of traffic, the S. Congregation ordered at the same time that an announcement should be posted in the church instructing the people that the alms (stipends) on that day will be offered for a high Mass commemorating the souls of all the faithful departed. "Apponatur tabella in ecclesia quo fideles doceantur quod illis ipsis eleemosynis una canitur missa in die Commemorationis omnium Fidelium defunctorum."

SEVEN OR EIGHT SACRAMENTS?

Qu. It is certain that deaconship is a Sacrament. Priesthood is also a Sacrament, because the three essentials are present: *signum sensibile, institutum a Christo Domino, et collativum gratiae.* Therefore there are eight Sacraments, or the Sacrament of Holy Orders can be received more than once. Neither of these conclusions can be held. Please show me the way out of the dilemma.

Resp. Perhaps we can make it plain by a simile. It is certain that a gas-flame is a light; a Welsbach-flame is also a light; for in both the essentials of radiation are represented. But a Welsbach-flame is a gas-flame intensified by the addition of a metallic mantle. Thus each of the two lights constitutes a flame, and yet the two may be so combined as to make a single flame, the one being the complement or perfection of the other.

Deaconship lights the sacramental flame; the priesthood and the pontificate heighten the efficient grace of the clerical state by intensifying, so to speak, the light and heat which proceed from the same sacramental fire. Add a spark of fire to another spark, and the two become one with increased power.

CORRECTION IN FATHER DYER'S ARTICLE.

In the paper by the Rector of Dunwoodie Seminary on the Organization of Classes and Studies in our Theological Schools, a regretable misprint (October number, page 340, seventh line) occurred by the substitution of "desirable" for *undesirable,* as the word should read.

Recent Bible Study.

FATHER DELATTRE published in the July number of the *Questions Scientifiques* a paper on our present knowledge of the Assyro-Babylonian civilization,[1] in which he practically summarized all the results of our modern excavations and discoveries. But, however surprising may be the accuracy of our present acquaintance with the life of those remote days, it appears that the near future will perfect it considerably. The London *Daily News*, in a report about the remarkable discovery of the great temple library at Nippur this year, expresses the following hope: "It is, in fact, hardly too much to say that if the unexplored parts should prove as rich in results as that already found, there will be no example in the world's history, not even in Egypt, of so complete a recovery of the records of an ancient civilization." We spoke about the work done at Nippur by the Americans under Professor Hilprecht, of Philadelphia, in our September issue.[2] Our readers will be glad to learn that Messrs. Luzac & Co., of London, have recently published the letters and inscriptions of Hammurabi, King of Babylon about 2300 B. C. A series of letters written by other kings of the first dynasty of Babylon have been added, and the edition gives an English translation, besides the original Babylonian text. Hammurabi is generally identified with Amraphel of Genesis 14, so that, even at the time of Abraham, there existed a regular system of correspondence between rulers and their subordinates, and writing was employed not only to record events in the royal annals, but for ordinary purposes. If we keep in mind that the present series of letters antedates the famous Tel-el-Amarna tablets by a period of about 1000 years, we may feel prepared to agree with a writer in *Biblia* for August, who pronounces them the "most important series of inscriptions which has ever been rescued from Oriental ruins." Among the discoveries that shed light on Biblical questions, we must not omit the finds made

[1] La Civilization Assyrio-Babylonienne.

[2] Page 322.

on the site of ancient Ephesus by the authorities of the British Museum, since they graphically illustrate the narrative, in the Book of Acts, of the disturbances in the theatre of Ephesus, and of the significance of the worship of Diana to the life and trade of the city. Similarly, the magistrates of Thessalonica are called in the Book of Acts "politarchs," a name which does not occur in any other place in Greek literature, excepting an inscription on an arch in the city, demolished some years ago. Again, several of the Fayum documents use the word "meris" to designate certain divisions in that region; this shows that the author of Acts had sufficient authority for employing the same Greek word in the meaning of "district" in Act. 16.

The translation of the New Testament into the broad Scottish dialect of Burns may be regarded as a Biblical curiosity rather than any real advance in Bible study. The Atlanta *Constitution*[3] gives a few specimens that may be regarded as fair illustrations of the translation. The Our Father, *e.g.*, reads: "Faither o' us a', bidin aboon. Thy name be holle. Lat thy reign begin. Lat thy wuil be done, baith in yirth and heevin. Gie us ilka day oor needfu' feudin. And forgie us a' oor ill deeds, as we een fargae thae wha did us ill. And lat us na be siftit, but save us frae the Ill-Ane." The Very Rev. Canon McIntyre, D.D., Professor of Scripture at Oscott College, publishes the Gospel of St. Matthew in a very cheap and handy edition.[4] The print is large and clear; the chapters are arranged in paragraphs, with the verses numbered in the margin, and the editor's notes are given at the bottom of the pages. In spite of these many excellencies, the book sells for a penny a copy; we hope the Society may be able to issue without much delay the Biblical series of penny-booklets which it intends to publish. Such tracts may not deepen Biblical study, but they promote it indirectly by extending its sphere of interest.

According to the *Neue-Kirchen Zeitung*[5] the defenders of Higher Criticism have partially succeeded in popularizing their tenets by introducing them into the examination papers of a Berlin gymnasium. The editor prints a number of questions and

[3] July 17.

[4] London: Catholic Truth Society.

[5] Cottbus, n. 12.

answers from this latter source, and assures us that they are an almost verbatim reproduction. The history of the people of Israel is said to begin with Moses, all the patriarchs down to Josue being represented as legendary characters. St. Paul's use of the history of the patriarchs is ascribed to his sharing in the prejudices of his times. The composition of the books contained in the Hexateuch is placed between 1400 and 400 B. C., the book of Daniel is assigned to 165 A. D., and the whole religious life of the people is represented as the product of historical evolution. The synoptic Gospels are supposed to be founded on the "sayings of the Lord" and the original Mark, while the fourth Gospel is said to have been written in Alexandria by a Jewish Christian, about 100 A. D. This Gospel is full of allegories, being the product of philosophical speculation rather than of historical inquiry. The Lord's Supper is a mere historical reminiscence, and all the mystical ideas connected with it by the Christians are said to be contrary to the spirit of the gospel. The Christians were persecuted in Rome, not on account of their religion, but because they were regarded as incendiaries. These views, which in Berlin are placed in the examination papers, are supported by prominent High-Churchmen in England. According to Canon Gore, it would not be "materially untruthful," but it would be uncritical to attribute the whole legislation to Moses. Mr. Illingworth is of opinion that "the very form of the account in Genesis is too obviously Oriental and mythical to be pressed into history in the Western sense of the word." The late head of the Pusey House discovers in the writers of the New Testament differences in point of view regarding the person of Christ, and distinct stages of doctrinal development. Our Lord's discourses on the end of the world, *e. g.*, "cannot be described as history written before by the hand of Omniscience."

Dr. J. Nikel, of Breslau, has contributed to *Biblische Studien* a monograph on the restoration of the Jewish commonwealth after the Babylonian exile.[6] He first gives a sketch of Israel in exile, then considers the fall of Babylon and the decree of Cyrus; after this the restoration proper begins; the exiles return, the temple is

[6] Die Wiederherstellung des Jüdischen Gemeinwesens nach dem Babylonischen Exil. Freiburg: Herder. 1900.

restored under Cyrus and Darius I, the work of Esdras begins and is followed by that of Nehemias; both in common restore the religious life of the nation, and finally the second governorship of Nehemias completes the period. The writer may not always agree with his predecessors in the same field of study, but he can hardly be said to advance any position without solid proof. It is a real pleasure to meet with such a soberly written historical study on the history of Israel after all the wild theories on the same subject that fill our current literature. There is even a great difference to be noticed between the work of Dr. J. Nikel and that of F. Giesebrecht.[7]

W. M. Arnolt published in the July number of the *American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures* a study on the Urim and Thummim,[8] described in Ex. 28: 13–30, and referred to in Lev. 8: 7 f; Dt. 33: 8; 1 Ki. 14: 41; 28: 3–6; Esdr. 2: 63. In general, the Urim and Thummim were a means of communicating with God; the Lord was directly consulted by means of them. When prophecy gained the ascendancy, the Urim and Thummim fell into desuetude, so that there is no instance on record that they were consulted after the time of David. The opinions as to what the Urim and Thummim were are faithfully recorded; they were stones in the high-priest's breastplate, or a kind of sacred dice, or again, little images of "truth" and "justice." We believe, however, that W. Smith has more probability on his side when he traces the institution to an Egyptian source than has W. M. Arnolt in his theory of their Babylonian origin. In the July number of the *Expository Times*,[9] Professor Hommel, of Munich, published a study on a Rhetorical Figure in the Old Testament, Jer. 7: 22, and Dt. 5: 3. The former passage contains the well-known words: "For I spoke not to your fathers, and I commanded them not in the day that I brought them out of the land of Egypt, concerning the manner of burnt-offerings and sacrifices." The professor draws attention to an Arabic figure of speech, bearing the name of "a denying the original sense

[7] Die Geschichtlichkeit des Sinaibundes untersucht. Königsberg, 1900.

[8] The Urim and Thummim: a Suggestion as to Their Original Nature and Significance.

[9] Pages 439-441.

of the word,"[10] which he illustrates by several passages taken from Arabic writers. In the light of this figure of speech, the prophetic passage means that God demanded not only burnt-offerings and sacrifices, but also obedience,[11] or not so much the former as the latter. The August number of *The Expository Times* gives the views of Professor Nestle, of James Moffat, and of Professor König on Hommel's suggestion. Professor Nestle wishes to explain the foregoing passage of Jeremiah by "the idiom of exaggerated contrast," which, according to this writer, is common in the Bible. James Moffat tells us that a similar construction has been found by Professor Blass[12] in New Testament Greek; he believes that even the New Testament idioms may have found their way into the Gospels on account of the Arabic figure of speech. Professor König appears to be the only writer who rejects the relative negation of Jeremiah 7 : 22. He maintains that the absolute sense of the negation must not be exchanged for the relative, unless it be inexorably demanded; Professor Hommel's illustrations, we are told, do not inexorably demand this change. We are sure that Professor König would not deign to answer such a difficulty, if it were proposed by one of his pupils. Professor Hommel, in "a Last Word on a Rhetorical Figure in the Old Testament,"[13] does, therefore, well in inviting his friends to reread his first article in order to avoid König's sophistry. We have stated repeatedly that Professor Margoliouth identifies the lately discovered Hebrew text of Ecclesiastes with a retranslation of the book into Hebrew, and not with the original text. It may suffice for the present to add that the professor's continued discussion has only served to lay bare the weakness of his arguments.

Father L. Méchineau writes on the symbolism found in the fourth Gospel;[14] he analyzes first the view of the Abbé Loisy,[15] and then reviews the opinion of Isidore Desprès.[16] We need not

[10] *Cf.* A. F. Mehren, Rhetorik der Araber, Copenhagen and Vienna, 1853.

[11] Verse 23.

[12] Grammatik des N. T.-lichen Griechisch, p. 261 n.

[13] *The Expository Times*, September, p. 564.

[14] Le Symbolisme dans l'Évangile de S. Jean; *Études*, September 5, 1900, pp. 632 ff.

[15] *Cf.* Le Prologue du quatrième èvangile; *Revue d'histoire et de littérature religieuses*, 1897, p. 266.

[16] L'évangile selon S. Jean: *Revue du clergé français*.

say that the strict historicity of the Gospel is defended by the writer against its allegorist enemies; moreover, it is maintained that on this point of exegesis there is no opposition between traditional theology and theologians on the one side, and Sacred Scripture, the apostolic tradition, and the body of the patristic writers on the other. It is with sincere pleasure that we welcome Dr. Karl Joseph Müller's new commentary on the Epistle to the Philippians;[17] for at present the study of the Bible is progressing so rapidly that our books on Biblical subjects become very soon antiquated. Dr. Müller is right in either omitting or treating only briefly the tenets of the Tübingen school; this gives him more space for refuting the more recent erroneous systems concerning the Epistle. The dogmatic passages, 2: 5–11 and 3: 1–11, have received the special attention of the author. During the year there has been quite a discussion on the precise meaning of the term "Son of man." Professor Baldensperger,[18] reviewing the controversy, gives three possible sources of the expression: the book of Daniel, Jewish theological thought, and the Aramaic idiom "barnash." According to this last derivation, the phrase means merely "I;" according to the first derivation, it has a Messianic meaning, which is not necessarily connected with its second derivation. Owing to the arguments of Eerdmons and Lietzman, Wellhausen has been somewhat shaken in his anti-Messianic explanation, and Professor Harnack writes:[19] "I am convinced that it would be gross violation of all principles of interpretation to find in this term anything else than a name for Jesus as the promised Messiah."

[17] Des Apostels Paulus Brief an die Philipper. Freiburg: Herder. 1899.

[18] Theologische Rundschau, Nos. 6, 7.

[19] Das Wesen des Christentums, p. 82.

Book Review.

THE HEXATEUCH according to the Revised Version. Arranged in its Constituent Documents by Members of the Society of Historical Theology, Oxford. Edited with Introduction, Notes, Marginal References, and Synoptical Tables by J. Estlin Carpenter, M.A., Lond., and G. Harford-Battersby, M.A., Oxon. In two vols. London, New York, and Bombay: Longmans, Green & Company. 1900. Pp. 279—359.

The work before us presents essentially an elaborate inquiry into the authentic literature of ancient Israel. By the application of critical methods to the oldest group of Biblical documents the editors endeavor to show that the Book of Joshua is the literary sequel to the Mosaic books known as the Pentateuch, and accordingly they place the collection under one category, giving it the name Hexateuch.

The first volume opens with a survey and comparison of the different systems which literary criticism formerly employed, covering not only the sacred writings of Israel, but also other historical records, such as Asser's Life of Alfred, the *Saxon Chronicle*, the early English Laws, the Buddhist and Brahmanical sacred literature. Thence the degrees of probability in critical results are deduced. An examination of the literary construction of the Pentateuch leads to the inference of its composite character. That there is post-Mosaic material in the Pentateuch had been pointed out by Jewish rabbis as early as the tenth century and was admitted by Catholic scholars as well as by the Protestant translators of the sixteenth century. The critics of the seventeenth century, Hobbes, Spinoza, Simon, Le Clerc, made this more clear; and the search for a clew to the documents which, as became evident, had been used in the composition of the Pentateuch, led to a number of theories which are in turn examined by the writers of the Introduction in the work before us. Here we have, indeed, all the learned results of the higher criticism, not only as the internal evidence suggests and calls for it, but also in its relation to the study of archæological facts apart from the sacred text. This part of the work of Messrs. Carpenter and Harford-Battersby, whom Professor Cheyne aided by furnishing pertinent evidence from Assyrian and Babylonian monuments, is worthy of the amplest recognition. The authors fully carry out the original purpose of their investigation, by setting before the student of the Hebrew books the material for an

intelligent survey of the intricate questions of Biblical criticism. The tabular appendices, with their lists of words and phrases, their different analytical and synoptical programmes of the Hexateuchal writings, are marvels of industry and proportionate helpfulness. The Introduction to Joshua, in the second volume, contains some views which might have been usefully anticipated in the general introduction to the Hexateuch; but their omission may be due to the difficulty of getting out such a work within a limited period, allowing a proper revision of the whole.

The text employed is, as the title indicates, that of the English Revised Version. Here and there, however, we find marginal renderings introduced into the text; and the fact that a careful note has been taken throughout of the renderings of the Hebrew text as interpreted by recognized modern Biblical scholars renders the work useful to the student of the Bible irrespective of his particular religious convictions.

THEOLOGIA FUNDAMENTALIS, quam Romae in Collegio Internationali S. Antonii tradit et docet P. Gabriel Casanova, O.F.M., Lector Jubil. S. Theol. Provinciaeque S. Gregorii M. Philippinarum Alumnus et Filius. Romae: Typogr. Sallustiana. 1899. Pp. 608.

A new text-book of theology by a Spaniard, and by a disciple of the Seraphic Doctor, two titles which at one time served as a goodly passport through the domains in which the theological disciplines were highly honored. The volume, one only!—be it punctuated with a blessing of the eager student—is issued in Rome, where the work of its publication ripened into maturity during a recent course taught by the author at the College of San Antonio; in all other respects it is the result of many years' labor and teaching in the Spanish province of the Philippine Islands.

The work is in no way a disappointment. Like his confrère of the same school, Albert à Bulsano, better known as P. Knoll, our author consults an actual need; and if he is just a little more ornate and poetical, as evidenced by his choice of phrase, than the plain and sensible Capuchin of the Tyrol, he is to the point and practical.

As a rule our students in theology build up their knowledge of the various doctrines in separate sections from base to roof-tree. We take a tract, such as *De Deo Creatore*, or *De Gratia*, and furnish the mind with all that can be said upon it (much of which might be left unsaid without loss of clear notions on the particular subject treated); then we go to the next tract. A better mode of acquiring knowledge

seems to be that which completes first the foundations of all the parts and then proceeds to their gradual development on the synthetical plan. This is the purpose of the work before us. P. Casanova steadily keeps the path of St. Thomas; but he does not neglect to remind us that there are two great doctors besides the Angelic, who shed light upon difficult questions: one, the Doctor Seraphic, especially in the region of mystic theology, and the other, he who, by his keen critique, won the name of the Subtle Doctor.

We have here, therefore, a complete vindication of the Catholic Church, representing the doctrine of Christ, first as demonstrated to the infidel, the rationalist, and the Jew; next as demonstrated to the heretic and the schismatic. At the end we have proofs calculated to meet the arguments and difficulties of Protestants and what are called moderate rationalists. They deal with the authority and interpretation of Sacred Scripture, with the value of tradition as a source of revelation, with the interrelations of science, philosophy, and faith. The author shirks no difficulties, and shows himself familiar with the vagaries of modern error and its literature, especially as rampant in Germany.

The typography is, as in most Italian publications, just a trifle behind the works of English or American printers, but clean and distinct. The essential and important parts of the text, which all students are expected to master, are in larger type, and distinct from those portions which the more advanced scholars would appreciate.

A DAY IN THE CLOISTER. Adapted from the German of Dom Sebastian von Oer, O.S.B., of St. Martin's Abbey, Beuron. By Dom Bede Camm, O.S.B. St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder. 1900. Pp. 291.

Here is a book for the curious non-Catholic who feels the inclination to pry into the secrets of convent life. A day in the cloister means a lifetime in the cloister; for the echoes of eternity, which the founders of monastic institutes intended to concentrate in the conventual life, ring such harmonies into the soul of the true religious that the variety of all sounds blends into a single, sweet, unending melody. Such unity makes beauty, and the soul never wearies of it unless by way of trial, which refines the spiritual sense, realizing the charms of life solely in God only the more in the end.

But Catholics will learn much more from the story of the Benedictine monk who tells with the native simplicity of truth what he has observed and known and lived in his own convent home. "There is a mysterious charm about the cloister which attracts even the world-

ling;" and his desire to know something of it is for the most part satisfied "by novelists and poets who have sought to raise the veil by sketching imaginary pictures of the life of the cloister, pictures that are as a rule as far from the truth as *Gulliver's Travels* or the *Arabian Nights*." Although the present sketch does not describe any particular abbey in the world, it describes them all by portraying the ideal as outlined in the constitution of the great patriarch of monastic homes, St. Benedict. Hence, as we follow the writer who leads us to and through the convent, lighting up our path with bright bits of edifying information and incident, we are growing familiar with the spirit that rules in the various foundations of the evangelical counsels.

Dom von Oer takes the reader into a mountain district, with rich green slopes and thick forests, on a pathway that leads to a stately abbey crowning the near-by hill. Upon the way they observe the lay-brothers of the monastery at their daily work in the field, and learn the lesson of uniting prayer with labor. Entering the gate they scan each object and each person as they pass. The pictures on the wall speak to them of the founder and his noble work, of many a sacrifice and many a victory for truth. The corridors, the chapel, the library, the workshops—all are replete with lessons of virtue told in storied legend and in living example. The monks in the refectory, at recreation, and in the garden, teach the precepts of sobriety, of holy joy, and such rest and peace as the world cannot afford. The whole is so simply and chastely told as to retain a silent longing for the vocation of the hidden life in Christ. One of the most instructive as well as the most attractive features of this quiet monastic activity is found in the description of the religious at prayer, at the divine offices in the well-appointed and beautiful church of the abbey.

We lay down the volume with a sense of gratitude to the good monk of the Beuron community who has opened the gateway and allowed us a glimpse into this abode of peace where the *ora et labora* are perpetually weaving a living chain that leads men to paradise; and many a reader will bless the translator, the nun of St. Scholastica's Priory, whose work Father Camm found ready at hand for his useful adaptation. The book is beautifully illustrated and a model of typography, one of such as have rarely come from our Catholic press.

OUR MOTHER. By Frances I. Kershaw, author of "Mrs. Markham's Nieces," "Cup of the Tregarvans," etc. London: Burns & Oates; New York: Benziger Brothers. 1900. Pp. 449.

Sister Frances Kershaw writes the history of the foundress of the English Apostolines, Mother Ismay Oliver. The daughter of an

English parson, she developed at an early age the spirit of independence in religious matters, which by the time she had reached her nineteenth year left her a decided sceptic. Clever, yet serious, with a turn for investigation, and averse, as she declares, to shams and marriage, she soon found herself confronted with the practical dilemma which meets the sober mind when brought into contact with genuine Catholicism. A young friend whom she happened to visit, herself a convert, was the unsuspecting instrument which induced Miss Oliver to inquire into the claims of the Church to be the divinely commissioned teacher of truth. Against all opposition of parents and friends she followed the trend of her convictions and was received into the Church. To the trials from without came trials from within—doubts, not about the truth of the Catholic religion, but about her own vocation. Like most fervent converts of her age, she felt a keen attraction for the self-denying spirit of the religious orders. After repeated attempts—rather many—to adapt her life to the austere rule of St. Teresa and the mediæval contemplatives, she felt an impulse to inaugurate an altogether new work for the glory of God. As a result we find her instituting a religious community under the auspices of the Bishop of Nottingham, which devotes itself mainly to the education of the young and of converts, but in a spirit somewhat different from that of other religious institutes in England. One feature of the Apostoline rule, which strikes us as notably distinct, and as perhaps indicative of the peculiar spirit of the institute, is that the religious ordinarily attend the parish church for Mass and devotions instead of making use of their own separate oratories. They are obliged, furthermore, always to use their influence to develop in others the parochial spirit by fostering devotion to parish work in preference to pious undertakings in other churches.

The writer herself indicates the good which this biography is designed to effect. She gives the reasons that prompted her to write it. It will furnish lights to those who have a religious vocation. It may prove useful to souls outside the Church who are sincerely seeking the truth. "It may become the means of leading a few more lovers of an apostolic and poor life to devote themselves to God in our humble institute" (Chap. I). The book is written in such a pleasant, chatty style that one is attracted and disposed to read it a second time, and in this respect it offers an agreeable contrast to the stereotyped biographies of holy people, such as one naturally assumes the founders of religious orders to be.

There is only one thing which throws a sort of distrust upon the

whole otherwise edifying story, and which causes an occasional suspicion. The writer repeats thoughts and words of the supposed Mother Foundress which she could hardly have had access to even if the lady Ismay kept and left behind her a very minute journal of her foolish as well as her sober moods. Besides this, there is a lack of dates and places which one can scarcely account for in a record of religious activity such as the writer pretends to give in her book. We might be disposed to look upon the whole as a piece of pious fiction if there were not in it some mention of facts and persons that would forbid fictitious trifling with. Such liberty the author might perhaps take with her own person—just as Mark Twain does—but not with another. Or can it be that "Our Mother" is Sister Kershaw herself, impersonating Santa Ismay for the edification of the children? "'When I am gone, you will take my place, dear child.' I reminded her of her promise to pray that we might die together." Perhaps that is it; but in that case the book as a record of religious activity is misleading without any warning apart from intrinsic evidence.

INSTITUTIONES JURIS NATURALIS, seu Philosophiae Moralis Universae, secundum Principia S. Thomae Aquinatis, ad usum scholarem, adnoravit Theodorus Meyer, S.J. PARS II—JUS NATURAE SPECIALE. St. Louis, Mo.; Freiburg: B. Herder. 1900. Pp. xxvi—852.

Although the present volume on moral philosophy may have been impatiently expected by those who for fifteen years have been acquainted with its elder brother, still whatever disappointment its long coming may have occasioned will doubtless be compensated for by the generally excellent character of the new section of the work. The recent volume, it will be noticed, has almost doubled the proportions of the former. This is of itself no uncertain sign of merit, as it indicates that the author has allowed himself ample room for handling the large and difficult problems of special ethics.

The ground covered in the preceding volume is that which falls under the caption General Ethics. In it the universal principles and rules of morality are set forth and explained. The volume at hand has to do with the theoretico-practical application of these principles and laws, or, as the author expresses it, with the subsuming of minor propositions under the general majors previously laid down, and deducing the conclusions which sum up the special duties of man, both as a private individual and as a social being, in the family and in the State. The lines here and their main content are of course familiar to everyone who has any knowledge of scholastic ethics. The special value,

therefore, of the work lies on the one hand in the fuller and perhaps deeper insight it affords beyond what can be expected from the more restricted text-book, and on the other hand in the larger acquaintance it manifests with alien forms and systems of speculation. In these respects the work will be both welcome and satisfying to those interested in its subject-matter. Perhaps a fuller reference to the literature of ethics, especially in English, might be expected from so scholarly a work; but doubtless the author was unwilling to load his pages with names answering to opinions whose measure of truth he had otherwise presented and whose errors he had at least implicitly refuted.

With this volume the *Cursus Lacencis*, begun twenty years ago with Father Pesch's Institutes of Natural Philosophy, is completed, at least so far as its conspectus indicates. It seems a pity its authors did not provide for a section on the history of philosophy. Works by Catholic writers on this important subject are unfortunately too few. Its omission from the *Cursus Lacensis* is greatly to be regretted, as it leaves the most worthy modern structure of Catholic philosophy without roof or crown.

MORALPHILOSOPHIE. Eine wissenschaftliche Darlegung der sittlichen, einschliesslich der rechtlichen Ordnung von Victor Cathrein, S.J. Dritte, verbesserte und vermehrte Auflage. Erster Band—Allgemeine Moralphilosophie. Zweiter Band—Besondere Moralphilosophie.

PHILOSOPHIA MORALIS. In usum scholarum. Auctore Victore Cathrein, S.J. 1900.

RELIGION UND MORAL, oder, Gibt es eine Moral ohne Gott? Eine Untersuchung des Verhältnisses der Moral zur Religion. Von Victor Cathrein, S.J. 1900.

DURCH ATHEISMUS ZUM ANARCHISMUS. Ein lehrreiches Bild aus dem Universitätsleben der Gegenwart. Allen, denen ihr Christentum lieb ist, besonders aber den angehenden Akademikern gewidmet von Victor Cathrein, S.J. Zweite erweiterte Auflage. 1900. St. Louis, Mo.; Freiburg: B. Herder. 1899.

That a third edition of so large a work as Father Cathrein's *Moralphilosophie* should be demanded within the comparatively short space of eight years is an indication both of the growing interest recently taken in ethical science and of the merit of this particular contribution to its literature. As the previous editions have been noticed in these pages, it will suffice to point out here, for the benefit of those who possess an earlier edition, the particular alterations made in the new form.

The first volume has been increased by seventy-five and the second by sixty-six pages. The section on the relation of the moral good to man's ultimate end (pp. 252–257) is new; so, too, are the sections on some false views as to conscience (390–393); on the meaning of the concept of right in the science of jurisprudence and the method of its determination (412 ff.); on modern empiricism and the doctrine of right (443 ff.); on the notions of morality prevailing amongst the ancient Romans (541 ff.) the Chinese Taoists (531 ff.); the Futina Islanders (565 ff.); the Key Islanders, and other African tribes. The portions of the volume dealing with Kant's and Wundt's ethical teachings have been recast, as have been, also, those treating of the difference between objective good and evil, the question of probabilism, and various recent views of right.

In the second volume revision and development have been given to various subjects, such as the basis of socialism (143 ff.); the State and the social question (583 ff.); the origin of civil power (453 ff.); taxation (625); suffrage (677); civil punishment (633); international tribunals, and some other more or less important points.

Besides these alterations in the contents, the present edition appears in a dress which is quite in keeping with the excellent character of the work itself.

Almost simultaneously with the appearance of the third edition of the foregoing work, a third impression of the same author's *Philosophia Moralis in usum scholarum* is published. This class-manual is so well known as one of the most important works of its kind that the mere mention of its recent revision will suffice to satisfy its claims on these pages. The present edition has been enlarged by about thirty pages. The additions and alterations in the text count some thirty-four in all. Although not of vital moment the emendations are such as add to the clarity and efficiency of the work as a text-book.

Another work by the same author dealing with the basis of ethics in a way most called for at the present time is *Religion and Morality*. The subtitle, "Is there an Ethic without God?" gives at a glance the field and purpose of the book. The treatment runs in three channels: one historical, the other expository, and the third critical. A sketch of the efforts made by materialism and positivism to construct an "independent" theory of morality is followed by an outline of the propaganda set up to popularize such theories in France, Germany, and the United States (1–35). The Christian doctrine, philosophical and

theological, on the relationship between morality and religion, is briefly explained (36–48). The third and larger part of the work proves the impossibility of "independent" ethics. The conclusions established are: first, that without belief in the personal God, Creator of the universe and Lord and Master of all things, the *unity*, *universality*, and *immutability* of moral concepts and principles are inexplicable; secondly, human life loses its purpose and end; thirdly, and consequently its value and meaning; fourthly, the longings and strivings of the human heart are objectless and aimless; fifthly, the freedom of the will unexplainable and impossible; sixthly, conscience and duty are empty words; seventhly, the moral order is sanctionless; eighthly, right and justice and true authority are left without a firm foundation. These positions are clearly and solidly established, and with that constant recognition of the views and speculations of adversaries, which reflects in miniature the method and temper and literary form of the *Moralphilosophie*.

The little book, *From Atheism to Anarchism*, though not designedly connected with the preceding, may be called a practical embodiment of the effects of an "independent ethic" when taken from the lecture-hall into actual life. In the form of a story the development of an atheistic education is followed into its logical and practical result, anarchism. Alfred, the hero of the tale, is a bright young lad, pure and manly, well educated, the pride of his devoutly Catholic parents, who send him to a German university to prepare himself for the legal profession. Coming under the influence of infidel theorizing disguised under the specious terminology of pseudo-science, he loses his faith and becomes eventually an anarchist. Wounded in a duel, he is taken to a hospital, where the prayers of the good religious and the instruction of a learned priest become the instruments of grace in effecting his conversion. The plot is simple and of course familiar. The merit of the story lies in the fact that it is a true tale of real life. Alfred is not a fictitious character, but stands for a prominent jurist in Germany, who, after passing through the sea of doubt and unbelief, has regained his faith and done good service for the Catholic cause in the Fatherland. The theories which led the young man to his ruin are not fanciful, but the explicit teaching of the leading professors in the German law academies; and the author imputes to them no tenet for which he does not cite chapter and verse from their printed works. The book has done much good in Germany, and it were greatly to be desired that its influence were widened through an English translation.

THE GOLDEN LEGEND; or, Lives of the Saints, as Englished by William Caxton. Edited by F. S. Ellis. Vols. III and IV, "Temple Classics." New York: The Macmillan Company; London: J. M. Dent & Co. 1900.

If there were nothing in these pretty little books but William Caxton's quaint introduction (Vol. I), in which he reveals the motives of his translating the *Legenda Aurea*, one would feel one's self enriched in the spiritual edification it alone affords. But it is the legends themselves in which, on the one hand, we seem to hear the majestic roll of the solemn chants of Advent and the rejoicings of Christmas, the penitential pleadings of the Lenten season and the triumphal songs of Easter, and on the other hand the wonderful simply told tales of the saints and the intermingling of the curious traditional folklore—that bring us almost into actual contact with the people of those days. Two of the little volumes in which these precious reminiscences of the past are fittingly treasured up have been noted in a preceding number of the REVIEW. Two more are here presented, which are equally attractive, and other two are yet to come.

LE GRAND SCHISME D'OCCIDENT. Par L. Salembier. Paris: Librairie Victor Lecoffre. 1900.

This is the fourth volume printed in the elaborate series of the *Bibliothèque de l'enseignement de l'Histoire ecclésiastique*. It is an admirable precaution taken by the publishers to issue the volumes, not in the order indicated by the Prospectus, or at any regularly recurring intervals, but simply when quite ready for the printer. The authors are thus given *carte blanche* to expend as much time and labor on their several tasks as the varying nature of the required studies may demand. Perplexing as are the conditions surrounding the Great Schism of the West, and diametrically opposed as are the judgments arrived at by its deepest students, it has nevertheless such a vast literature—contemporary, modern, and present-day—that a writer may not urge a deficiency of authorities. There is, indeed, an embarrassment confronting the historian who would narrate the details of that most disturbed epoch of Church History; but it is an embarrassment of *wealth* in the matter of authorities and sources. Much fruitful energy has been expended on the discovery, collation, and editing of these latter. The wealth of authorities and even of sources is, however, unfortunately in the inverse ratio of its clarifying power. In 1889 the abbé Gayet issued his large work on the Schism, basing his conclusions on contemporary documents deposited in the secret archives of the Vatican.

But that conclusion runs counter to the view—so rapidly becoming a traditional one with Catholic historians—that Robert of Geneva and his successors were false popes. In the same year appeared some half a dozen studies of the epoch concerned, and since then have appeared, in French, German, and English, some thirty-odd volumes—not to speak of a profuse periodical literature—either professedly dealing with, or indirectly illustrating, various phases of the same epoch. One is apt to be bewildered in the midst of such a large and constantly expanding mass of sources, authorities, and appreciations, rather than to be comforted by the hope of a speedy solution of the old, old difficulty. What has been wanted is a volume of not too undue proportions, that should give the reader first of all a vivid view of the age that saw the birth of the schism; its characteristics; its points of view and its practices; its theological, moral, and political features; and which should then give a consecutive narrative (unencumbered by a prolix contentiousness of private opinion) of the birth, growth, and death of that saddest of all occurrences in ecclesiastical history. Our author, who is Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the Catholic University of Lille, does this in his very readable and vivid narrative, which he manages to confine within the limits of 416 pages—limits not so unduly generous when the labyrinthine character of the subject is well considered. The studies rendered necessary by his previous work on Peter d'Ailly—of whom it has been said that his biography almost represents the story of the Great Schism itself—qualify him for his present task. He presents a splendid plea for the legitimacy of the Roman claimants. We should like to see the whole series, of which this is one issue, put into an English dress. The volumes are not meant to be exhaustive presentations of their several subjects, but are rather designed to fill that vast intermediate space which separates a jejune text-book from a profound dissertation meant only for specialists. Such a design is worthy of all encouragement, and we felicitate the publishers on the enterprising spirit which has urged them on to the conception of such an elaborate program.

H. T. H.

Recent Popular Books.[1]

AT THE SIGN OF THE SEVEN SINS: Arthur Le Queux. $1.50.

After suspecting all the innocent persons within her reach, and unearthing some pretty secrets, the heroine discovers that a perfect stranger killed the acquaintance whose murder transformed her into a detective. She is an unpleasant person, not because the author intends that she shall be, but because he is unskilled in portraying ladies.

BENNETT TWINS: Grace Marguerite Hurd. $1.50.

The twins, a girl and a boy, are permitted to go alone to New York to pursue their studies, and what with exploring extraordinary dining places, attending art classes, and having a studio in a building favored by students whose ideas of the Seventh Commandment and the code of etiquette are elastic, they learn more of human nature than of art or of literature. The author makes no attempt to imitate Murger or even Du Maurier, but is content to show the average American student and artist as he is, as a man refusing to acknowledge that he needs to forget his soul and his heart while training and using his eyes and hands. The story shows the faults of inexperience, but its author has humor, judgment, and can describe single scenes extremely well.

BLACK HOMES OF JIMTOWN: Ed. Mott. $1.25.

Rational beings may read a page of these stories in negro-minstrel dialect without falling asleep; but they are duller than is lawful, and should have been left in the comparative privacy of the space between Mr. Bones and Mr. Johnsing.

BREAKER OF LAWS: W. Pett Ridge. $1.50.

The hero, plain thief or burglar, as occasion serves, is the prey of a greedy receiver of stolen goods, who regards one-tenth of one per cent. as a high price to pay for his wares. The inevitable capture comes at last; but, after fulfilling his sentence, he finds that his wife is occupying a place of trust, and, supposing him to be dead, is teaching his son to respect his memory, and he shows his one redeeming trait of character by deciding to allow her to continue in happy error.

CENTURY OF AMERICAN DIPLOMACY: John W. Foster.

The title sufficiently describes the book, which terminates its formal narrative with General Grant's second administration, although it contains an added chapter on the Monroe doctrine, Mr. Cleveland's application of it, and its present value in international affairs. It is very cleverly written, and the author by no means holds himself obliged to praise any man or any official because of his American birth. Its impartiality is really extraordinary. A minute index and full table of contents, and a list of Secretaries of State add to its usefulness.

CHARMING RENEE; Arabella Kenealy. $1.50.

The beautiful but impecunious heroine marries a crippled peer, whose vicious sister-in-law desires to be enabled to visit him without scandal. The contest between the two women for the possession of the man's soul gives the book so strong a likeness to "The Second Lady Delcombe," as to create a suspicion that the two may be founded on one actual series of events. The author does not seem to intend impropriety; but some of the scenes are too intimate to be commended as art, or recommended for general reading.

CORNISH SMUGGLER; OR, CAPTAIN HARRY CARTER OF PRUSSIA COVE: Notes by John B. Cornish. $1.00.

The editor vouches for the genuineness of this autobiography of a smuggler, who, after being "converted," became a Methodist exhorter, and had some interesting experience as a French prisoner of war. His perfect calmness when relating his illegal acts is amazing, and his unregenerate spelling is exquisite beyond all imagination. His piety is not so entertaining as his wickedness; but his self-complacency never fails him, and his memoirs are of the kind that live.

COUNSEL UPON THE READING OF BOOKS: H. Morse Stephens, Agnes Repplier, Arthur T. Hadley, Brander Matthews, Bliss Perry, Hamilton Wright Mabie. Introduction by Henry Van Dyke. $1.00.

Highly condensed and carefully written essays on works of history, fiction, poetry, sociology, criticism, and biography are here grouped together, following a pleasant and rightly appreciative introduction. The writers make a remarkable group, each occupying a very conspicuous place in his profession, and all speaking with grave authority. Mr. Stephens's views of Carlyle and Froude, and Mr. Hadley's warning against certain much lauded writers are especially valuable.

[1] This department is designed to furnish the Reverend Clergy with brief critical notices of the publications of the month likely to gain considerable circulation. Each book is judged from the moral and Catholic point of view, so far as that is necessary to warn the reader of any noxious tendency or of the usefulness of any newly published book.

The prices given are those for which the books will be sent by the publisher postpaid. The best booksellers in large cities grant a discount of twenty-five per cent. except on choice books, but the buyer pays express charges.

DR. NORTH AND HIS FRIENDS: S. Weir Mitchell. $1.50.

Discussions of important topics carried on by a small group of friends, a love story quietly proceeding the while. The introduction of a financier whose standard of honor is unlike that of any honorable man, is the device by which current business methods are arraigned; but art, poetry, literature, and moral problems are the matters upon which the discourse chiefly turns. The volume belongs to a small but increasing class of books, all written within a few years, best described like the *Pall Mall Gazette*, in "Pendennis," as written by gentlemen for gentlemen.

FOURTH GENERATION: Sir Walter Besant. $1.50.

The marriage of a pair of young lovers ends a long chain of misfortunes in the man's family, the consequences of a murder committed by his great-grandfather, self-punished by seventy years of isolation and perfect silence. The author's intention of showing that the sufferings of the third and fourth generations in descent from a sinner are not to be regarded as the results of separate movements of the Divine will, but as effects having their cause in the sin, is worked out very elaborately and patiently. The vast fortune coveted by a hungry, greedy clan, a favorite theme with this author of late years, figures in this book, but acts in a new way, and two of the minor characters, who profess to be intensely respectable but are really engaged in dishonorable crafts, are enough in themselves to make a good comedy.

FRIENDS IN EXILE: Lloyd Bryce. $1.25.

There is a love story in this book, but it is entirely dull, and the salient character is an American minister who might be a lineal descendant of the Young Columbian. He solemnly assures a benighted foreigner that there are no women in the United States, all the female human creatures being ladies, and he countenances an adventuress, to the scandal of the whole diplomatic corps, because she is his countrywoman. The story might be mistaken for a satire, were it not for its leisurely solemnity. It seems written to please Birdofredum Sawin and Josiah Allen's wife.

FROM THE LAND OF THE SHAMROCK: Jane Barlow. $1.50.

Fourteen good stories, written with beautiful sympathy and also with the keenest appreciation of fun. Miss Barlow's work has been so clumsily imitated from purely mercenary motives that those who would naturally read it have become disgusted with all Irish stories, and she is by no means so well known as she should be in this country. She is the Mrs. Gaskell, the Miss Jewett of Ireland.

HEAVEN'S DISTANT LAMPS: Anna E. Mack. $1.50.

Although designed for a gift book, and bound and printed in accordance with that idea, this volume will be found useful for reference, for its editor has brought together nearly all the good poems of consolation and encouragement in grief in the English language. Many of these verses have never appeared before except in the author's editions, and even without them this would be the largest collection of its species. Catholic poets are well represented, but not by verses expressing any doctrine distinctively Catholic. On the other hand, as neither Calvinist nor Universalist is prone to express his cardinal doctrines in consolatory poetry, the Protestant verse has little sectarian color.

IN THE DESERT: Georg Ebers. $1.50.

The heroine, a romantic, hysterical simpleton, throws her family into a state of horrified alarm by announcing that she intends to marry a Bedouin chief, regardless of the wives whom he already possesses. Unfortunately for the prosecution of this scheme, the chief is unconscious of it, and, at the termination of his engagement as a guide, he takes his departure, and when sent for replies that he is now in another lady's service and that it is not meet that he should leave her. The heroine's self-deception is very funny.

ISLE OF UNREST: Henry Seton Merriman. $1.50.

The island is Corsica, whither go the hero and heroine, she to claim an inheritance, he to return to his ancestral home, which lies next to her estate. They find themselves instantly dragged into the island feuds, each, by virtue of being a landholder, theoretically heading a faction. Both refuse to live up to the island ideal of supreme virtue, and, after a time, the Franco-Prussian war takes both of them away. Most of the incidents of the story, including the revival of the feuds, comes from the action of a French soldier, apparently a quiet gentleman, but really a deep plotter. The other French characters are described sympathetically, the Corsicans rather coldly.

JAMES MARTINEAU: A BIOGRAPHY AND STUDY: A. W. Jackson. $3.00.

More "study" than "biography" occupies this volume, but it contains a reasonably full account of the author's life, and an enumeration of the Dissenters who illuminated Norwich and England in his youth, but have long been utterly forgotten. The author glorifies Dr. Martineau at the expense of his sister, the gifted but eccentric Harriet, whose autobiography accuses him of great cruelty. The closing two-thirds of the book will interest only clergymen and metaphysicians, although Dr. Martineau was for more than half a century the chief man of his sect. The statements regarding Miss Martineau will be hotly discussed among the female suffragists and kindred groups of discontented folk.

KING STORK OF THE NETHERLANDS: Albert Lee. $1.00.

An Elizabethan historical romance, the hero being a devoted follower of the Prince

of Orange, and suffering much at the hands of Anjou's adherents. The historical personages are wondrously wooden, those invented by the author being much more lifelike, but the book lacks ease of style, skill in arrangement, and probability in sequence of events not historical. As for the priests in the tale, they seem like lay figures from the studio of an artist of A. P. A. proclivities.

LIFE OF FRANCIS PARKMAN: Charles Haight Farnham. $2.50.

This biography criticises both the life and the works of its subject, and sometimes judges both by expediency, a lower standard than ever troubled Parkman himself, but it is not gossipping. It reveals an intensely conscientious, almost furiously industrious, man of noble ideals, fighting daily and hourly with a body so weak that even the citadel of the mind was ill-defended, and yet successfully accomplishing a self-imposed task heavy enough to overweight perfect health and perfect vision. His personal misfortune of agnosticism is not made attractive, and any reader of decent discernment can see that his discontent with Catholicism arose from the ignorance so common among Protestants, even when educated. As painstaking historian and intrepid political writer, he should be here studied.

LOST CONTINENT: Cutcliffe Hyne. $1.50.

The hero, viceroy of Yucatan, is hastily summoned to return to Atlantis, a usurping empress having need of him both as an honest administrator and as a soldier. Obeying, he is at once drawn into the contest between the audacious and unbelieving empress and his own clan of priests by whom the whole continent is at last destroyed as a course to be preferred to allowing the sacred mysteries of religion to be profaned by the imperial tyrant. The cave-tiger and the mammoth play the parts which the lion and the elephant would take in a Roman story, and the sea-lizard, pleasantly compounded of the actual cuttlefish and the fabulous sea-serpent, rules the waves.

OLD GENTLEMAN IN THE BLACK STOCK: Thomas Nelson Page. $1.50.

This holiday edition of a favorite love story has been enlarged by the addition of some details and has six illustrations in color, an illuminated title-page, and harmonious beauty of paper and typography. It is a charming story of true man and true maid, their kindly goodness making the title character a link between them.

ON THE WINGS OF OCCASION: Joel Chandler Harris. $1.50.

Five short stories of scouting, spies, and plots in the time of the civil war. They are cleverly planned, excellently written, and completely deceptive.

OUR JOAN: S. Baring Gould. $1.50.

The sudden death of their father leaves two sisters, Joan and Sibyl, penniless the family estate being entailed on their distant cousin. The elder sister obtains humble employment in a pottery and becomes a powerful influence for good among the girls, her fellow-workers, teaching them, succoring the sick, and opening her little house to them. She is incredibly beneficent, considering her wages and the number of hours in a day, but the exposure of the general dangers surrounding factory girls and the deadly mischief lying in wait for those in the potteries is not exaggerated, and the author's intention of enlisting sympathy is doubtless aided by his making the heir fall in love with the good elder sister, in spite of the efforts of the butterfly junior.

PAGEANTRY OF LIFE: Charles Whibley. $1.50.

Intentionally or otherwise, the author has produced a book that will almost inevitably arouse a young reader's curiosity in regard to memoirs, diaries, biographies, and kindred literature and divert him from fiction. Pepys, Chesterfield, Saint Simon, Bassompierre, De Ligne, Brummell, and many other striking real personages are artistically presented, and the reader is plainly told that what is laid before him is only the beginning. It is true that more than one of the figures in the pageant are not edifying in themselves, but the wicked are not praised, and the proportion of the moral to the immoral is at least as great as in common fiction.

PARIS: AS SEEN AND DESCRIBED BY FAMOUS WRITERS: Esther Singleton. $1.50.

Some sixty extracts from essays and novels describing churches and other public buildings, illustrated with good pictures. The absence of any note of Catholicity in the descriptions is striking; for instance, the Pantheon is the Pantheon without a hint of its melancholy history. Protestant bigotry may make this necessary in a book intended for American popular reading, but it deprives the volume of half of its possible beauty, and poetry, and romance.

PETERSBURG TALES: Olive Garnett. $1.50.

Five Russian stories, four giving a melancholy impression of life so permeated with intrigue, as minutely surveyed and investigated by the police, and so undermined by secret plotters that spontaneous action and speech are impossible. The fifth is a bit of pleasant comedy.

QUISANTE: Anthony H. Hawkins. (Anthony Hope.) $1.50.

A fascinating, ambitious man, dishonest in deed and thought, marries an upright woman whom fate compels to refrain from betraying his falsehoods. He is heartlessly treacherous to his family and to his party, but his crimes are shielded by his betters, who love him in spite of themselves. The letter in which his widow explains to a man really worthy of her and beloved by her, that she cannot marry him because she

feels degraded by her connivance at her husband's sins, is a masterpiece.

REAL DAVID HARUM: Arthur T. Vance. 75 cents.

A biography and many anecdotes of one David Hannum, in whom certain persons profess to find the model from which the fictitious David Harum was fashioned. The family and friends of the novelist have ineffectively denied the charge.

ROBERT ORANGE: "John Oliver Hobbes." $1.50.

The hero, having married a supposed widow, whose husband is in a few hours found to be alive, almost immediately enters the priesthood. The woman might possibly be declared the heiress of a small realm, and the persons who encourage the marriage act in the hope of compromising her and disqualifying her for the throne. She becomes an actress, and the worldling of the book, a Carmelite nun. Parts of the story are very clever, but it needs condensation, and some little knowledge as to the possibility of slipping into Holy Orders in a casual way.

ROYAL NAVY: William Laird Clowes. Vol. V. $6.50 (net).

This volume includes the history of the years 1803-1815, and has five photogravure portraits, a score of full-page pictures, and profuse text illustrations, like the preceding volumes, and also the carefully arranged tables, in themselves a history of the operations. The preface, together with an estimate of Nelson's unique services to his country, and his place among naval commanders, contains a frank and manly admission of the bravery of European and American foemen, and also of their seamanship.

SALT-BOX-HOUSE: Jane De Forest Shelton. $1.25.

The author relates the history of a Connecticut town and its people in the century immediately preceding the Revolution, making a "salt-box-house" the centre of events. Details of domestic and village life are described with considerable fulness, and some curious local customs are recorded. The title is the name given to a house including one or two stories in its roof, with intent to avoid a tax.

SHADOWINGS: Lafcadio Hearn (Koizumi Yakumo). $2.00.

Tales of fairy and ghoul; studies of the small, delicate pleasures of sound and prettiness in which the Japanese mind delights itself, and explorations of dreamland and the ghost country compose this volume, which is illustrated by exquisite pictures taken from a Japanese book, the work of a lifetime. The imaginative power shown in the last group is of the same wonderful quality as that displayed in former works, and one paper, "From a Dream-Book," although it does not pretend to be Christian, preaches a savagely earnest sermon against sin, and in praise of lofty thought and lofty deed. The style gives pleasure so keen as to elude definition or analysis.

SHORT STORY WRITING: Charles Raymond Barrett. $1.00.

Nominally, the author expounds the principles governing the production of the short story; actually, he enlivens his exposition by citing examples in which those principles are violated, and by characterizing them in the biting fashion by which some teachers and editors contrive to give their pupils and subordinates more instruction in a phrase than one of the "If-you-please-I-should-be-gratified-if-you-would-attempt-to-do-this" pedagogues and journalists can impart in a column. The little book would dispel drowsiness in the English literature classes of a young ladies' college, exaggerated although the assertion may seem.

SEGURD ECKDUL'S BRIDE: Richard Voss. $1.50.

The heroine is wooed and won by an Arctic explorer, although tacitly betrothed to the man who is the sole companion of his voyage. The latter returns alone, and after a time she marries him; but, discovering after his death that he is the murderer of Segurd, she reveals his secret to the world in order to prevent the erection of a monument to him. Both of the men are intensely selfish, with an absorption deepened by the climatic environment compelling constant thought of self, and it is difficult to decide which sins the more deeply against the other; but the heroine, suffering at the hands of both, is a touching and pathetic figure.

SOFT SIDE: Henry James. $1.50.

Twelve stories, nearly all relating an experience tragic to an individual or to a few persons, although simple and commonplace in appearance to those not immediately concerned. Some of the stories deal with tender self-deceptions maintained for years, or with affectionate devices for turning aside pain from beloved persons, and the uglier phases of Protestant and absolutely irreligious English life, conspicuous in the author's later books, appear in but two of the narratives.

SOUL OF THE STREET: Norman Duncan. $1.25.

The Oriental in New York, uncomprehended and uncomprehending, his shrewdness in judging men of his own blood, quite useless when applied to the West, his own simplicity mistaken for guile, and his guile for simplicity, is Mr. Duncan's subject. The turns of thought and expression, constantly suggesting Biblical scenes and personages, give the tales curious dignity, although their actual themes are simple.

SQUIRRELS AND OTHER FUR BEARERS: John Burroughs. $1.00.

The fifteen papers in this book are so clearly written that a child could under-

stand them and delight in them; but they deserve more than passing attention from adults, being quite devoid of the stupid sentimentality only too common in "animal books," and yet teaching avoidance of cruelty. The colored illustrations follow Audubon and are both spirited and faithful. It is well to bear the exact wording of the title in mind, for an inferior imitation of the book is sure to appear before the holidays, with a nearly similar name.

SYBARIS AND OTHER HOMES: Edward Everett Hale. $1.50.

This, the ninth volume of the author's "Works," had its origin in a half serious paper in the *Atlantic Monthly*, in which Sybaris was reconstructed from such fragments of its polity as the ancients have handed down to modern times. Like all such articles, it called forth endless criticism, both of itself and of cities neither comfortable nor beautiful, and created a standard by which young readers judged reality and real abuses. The result has been the inception of some reforms, the assistance of others, and a decided improvement in the condition of the poor. The volume will be found useful by all engaged in philanthropical work, but in one or two places they will come upon a phrase showing that the author does not like what he fancies Catholicity to be.

TALES OF THE EX-TANKS: A Book of Hard Luck Stories: Clarence Louis Cullen. $1.00.

A tank is an inebriate; an ex-tank is a reformed inebriate. The ex-tanks who relate the twenty-five stories in this book have merely transferred their intemperance from alcoholic liquors to the production of entirely vulgar narration unredeemed by the smallest elevation of thought or of a single passage of pure English.

TOMMY AND GRIZEL: James M. Barrie. $1.50.

This story, the sequel of "Sentimental Tommy," describes the gradual chastening and softening of an introspective and selfish temperament and the formation of a correct self-estimate. This austere intention is cloaked by a love story, and by much humorous by-play. The humor is charming, the pathos occasionally forced, and the climax of the book, a scene exhibiting the tedious ugliness of deliberate, sinful flirtation, has few peers in English fiction. Grizel's character is the counterpart of Tommy's, and she is a fine creature, although not to be classed among noble heroines. Hers are the small sweet virtues fit for the sequestered vale of life.

TOM'S BOY: Author of "Miss Torsey's Mission." $1.00.

This story will certainly be classified as a child's book because that is the fate of everything which its author writes. Really it is a love story, beginning a few years after Tom's marriage to a music-hall singer of good character but low birth. After some years of discomfort and privation she leaves him and goes to New York, and he takes his boy and himself back to his ancestral acres, and there hears of his wife's death. When Boy is fourteen years of age, the wife, supposed to be dead, returns to the English stage, and in the end she and Tom are reunited for a few happy weeks. The story is fit for a girl's reading, but children will not care for it.

TRANSITION PERIOD: G. Gregory Smith. $1.50.

This is the fourth volume of the "Periods of European Literature Series," now publishing in irregular order. The period covered is the fifteenth century, and the ballads, and miracle and mystery plays, and the growth of prose crowd the pages to such an extent that a second reading is almost necessary for the understanding of the author's views as to the slowness of transition from old fashions to new, from dead to living tongues. The criticism of individual authors is necessarily brief, but each is carefully brought into relation with his time.

TWELVE GREAT ARTISTS: William Howe Downes. $1.00.

After reading these papers on Hale, Rembrandt, Rubens, Fortury, Daubigny, Rops, Boutet de Monoel, Homer, the Shaw monument of St. Gaudens, Inves, La Farge and Sargent, and noting their pleasant adherence to the old-fashioned theory that art criticism should be literary and not flippantly illiterate, as the latest canons demand, the preface should be examined. With uncommon frankness, the author explains himself and his book, revealing the true journalist's character in an aspect seldom perceived or even suspected by newspaper readers. The criticisms are good, but the preface ought to neutralize reams of shallow disquisition from unworthy pens, and sensational stories about newspaper offices.

UNCANONIZED: Margaret Horton Potter. $1.50.

The hero, illegitimate son of a Catholic Archbishop of Canterbury in the reign of King John, becomes a monk to please his father, who pretends to be dying, and persuades the boy that it is his duty to expiate his father's sin. To this theological revelation the book adds another, viz.: that a soul goes downward from purgatory, and two of the personages undergo much tribulation because a baby "must" die without baptism, no monk or priest being accessible. The hero commits suicide to avoid being stoned by his fellow-monks for a flagrant breach of discipline, and this is treated as rather laudable than otherwise. The author is at some pains to refute Calvinist teachings which she represents as Catholic, but the book seems based on flawless ignorance rather than on malice. The stupendous absurdity of the title is consistent with the plot.

WITH BOTH ARMIES IN SOUTH AFRICA: Richard Harding Davis. $1.50.

In the former half of this book, the author writes with a British pen, almost from a British mind; in the latter, he speaks and seems to think as a Boer. Considered as a journalistic feat, the transformation is extraordinary, and the book probably gives a better view of the feelings of both parties than any one unskilled in estimating evidence could obtain by consulting scores of representatives on both sides. The illustrations are from photographs, and the author is not likely to have accepted any of those notoriously known to have been prepared to deceive.

WOMAN OF YESTERDAY: Caroline A. Mason. $1.50.

The heroine, desiring to be a missionary to the heathen, becomes affianced to a young man having similar intentions, for no other reason than for the wish to be protected while prosecuting her work. Later, when it is evident that he can never be a missionary, she abandons her own project and marries him to save his life, and becomes a devoted wife. The theology freely sprinkled everywhere is purely Calvinistic, the book being written for Protestant Sunday-school libraries.

WOUNDS IN THE RAIN: Stephen Crane. $1.50.

This is not a posthumous work, for two or three more volumes will be compiled from the author's manuscripts and published articles, but it has been issued since his death and without revision. The eleven stories describe episodes of war, and are as grim and unlovely as any member of the Peace Society could desire; but in spite of occasional sins against good taste, and some carefully committed misapplication of words they are very good.

Juvenile.

AGUINALDO'S HOSTAGE: H. Irving Hancock. $1.25.

Life in the Filipino and American camps and the general feeling among the Tagals are set forth in this story, in which Aguinaldo appears as a demagogue. [For children from ten to twelve years of age.]

ALMOST AS GOOD AS A BOY: Amanda M. Douglas. $1.50.

One of five sisters left in poverty by the premature death of their father, enters her uncle's factory, and becomes of great assistance to him. She weans him from various eccentricities, and is a great aid to her mother. [Ten to fourteen.]

BETWEEN BOER AND BRITON: Edward Stratemeyer. $1.25.

Two cousins, one the son of an English-American, the other the son of an Englishman settled in South Africa, are more or less involved in the events of the South-African war up to General Cronje's surrender. The author is without prejudice, but the villain happens to be Dutch. Ostrich-farming and lion- and antelope-hunting are the peaceful interests of the story. [Ten to fourteen.]

BOY DONALD: "Penn Shirley." 75 cents.

Eight young Californians, counting a dog, a monkey, and a parrot among their pets, and a polite Spanish boy among their friends, are shown to the reader, and taught a few lessons in conduct for his benefit. They are kindly folk and good associates. [Five to ten.]

CHILD OF GLEE, AND HOW SHE SAVED THE QUEEN: A. G. Plympton. $1.50.

The substitution of a small Yankee from Biddeford, Me., for a child-queen, whom conspirators seek to kidnap, is the chief incident of the book, which abounds in innocent fun and puzzling complications. [Eight to fourteen.]

GOLD-SEEKING ON THE DALTON TRAIL: Arthur P. Thompson. $1.50.

No slang, no villain, no comic character, no wondrous boy, and no stupid father appear in this book, which is written in good English. Information in regard to the Indians, plants, animals, and customs of the region, is blended with stories of hunting, fishing, and mining. [Ten to fifteen.]

HOUSE-BOAT ON THE ST. LAWRENCE: Everett T. Tomlinson. $1.50.

The summer adventures of a group of boys who rehearse and discuss the deeds of Frontenac. Unfortunately, they assume that whensoever the great pioneer disagreed with the Jesuits, the fault was theirs, and that they were dishonest schemers.

IN THE DAYS OF ALFRED THE GREAT: Eva March Tappan. $1.00.

A biography related with as much fulness of detail as is consistent with adherence to history in everything of importance. The style is attractive and not "adapted." [Ten and upward.]

IN THE HANDS OF THE REDCOATS: Everett T. Tomlinson. $1.50.

Life on the prison hulk Jersey, and among the patriots and loyalists of Monmouth, is the subject. The chief incidents are historical, and Fox's well-known description of the Jersey is quoted at length. The story is written with dignity, but the Irish speech of one personage is absurd. [Ten to twelve.]

JIMMY, LUCY, AND ALL: "Sophie May." 75 cents.

The diversions and mishaps of a little group of children making holiday at a California mountain hotel. Some of their sayings and doings are funny, but they are

well bred. The oldest tries to teach school and learns more than she teaches. [Four to fourteen.]

LITTLE DREAMER'S ADVENTURE: Frank Samuel Child. $1.25.

A book of fantasy, in which inanimate things are endowed with speech and with the power of making puns. Loving service is the lesson taught. [Twelve to fifteen.]

NAN'S CHICOPEE CHILDREN: Myra Sawyer Hamlin. $1.25.

Young girls addicted to easy philanthropy, comic small children, and hard-working young folk of both sexes are brought together in a pleasant summer home, carried on by "Nan." The book is a romance rather than a chronicle, but it is perfectly wholesome. [Ten to fifteen.]

PHEBE: HER PROFESSION: Anna Chapin Ray. $1.50.

The profession is medicine, but it is abandoned for matrimony, after a summer of amusing adventure. The spirit in which a profession should be adopted is one lesson of the book; another is a girl's obligation to be her best and noblest and most helpful self for the sake of her boy friends. [Ten to sixteen.]

RANDY'S SUMMER: Amy Brooks. $1.00.

Two sisters, each convinced of the other's superiority to all other girls; a city visitor anxious to brighten the quiet lives of the farmers and their families; and fathers, mothers, and neighbors, who lose their slight faults in the course of the story, make up a tale much too good to be true, but very good for the selfish and wilful to read. The pictures and text are from the same hand. [Eight to twelve.]

RIVAL BOY SPORTSMEN: W. Gordon Parker. $1.25.

Two clubs, encamped near one another, compete in many lines of sport, thereby developing some unsuspected merits and defects. Villains, addicted to variegated slang, beset the youngsters, but they are victors in the end. [Ten to twelve.]

SCOUTING FOR WASHINGTON: John P. True. $1.50.

The young hero outwits Tarleton, and captures his horse, after serving under him and in the British mounted infantry. The book is written with more vivaciousness than commonly appears in its species, and its presentation of life in British camp and transport is spirited. [Ten and upward.]

TRUE TO HIMSELF: Edward Stratemeyer. $1.00.

The hero's endeavor to clear his father's name from the imputation of crime brings him into contact with scoundrels of many sorts, from the convict to the apparently respectable merchant. His troubles are too severe to be credible.

TWO LITTLE STREET SINGERS: N. A. M. Roe. $1.00.

Two children, one stolen, the other an orphan, wander about with an Italian organ-grinder, making friends by the girl's beauty and the boy's manliness, and after many adventures enter into a state of prosperity. The style is diffuse, but this plot always interests children. [Six to ten.]

WILD ANIMAL PLAY: Ernest Seton Thomson. $1.00.

Verses and pictures for the use of children who wish to represent the animals in Mr. Thomson's books. The introduction of an angel to reprove a hunter who actually thinks of killing some of the animals is not in good taste, but this scene may easily be omitted.

Books Received.[1]

DER FAMILIENFREUND. Katholischer Wegweiser für das Jahr 1901. St. Louis, Mo.: "Herold des Glaubens," B. Herder. Pp. 112, quarto. An excellent almanac for clergy and laity.

DOCTRINES ET PROBLÈMES. Par Le R. P. Lucien Roure, S.J. Paris: Victor Retaux, Libraire-Editeur. 1900. Pp. 526. Prix, 7 francs.

THE HOLY ROSARY: Its Origin and Growth as a Devotion. Explanation of its Character and Merit, with Short Meditations on the Mysteries it commemorates. New York and Cincinnati: Fr. Pustet & Co. Pp. 62. Price, 5 cents. ($2.50 per hundred.)

OUR MOTHER. By Frances I. Kershaw. London: Burns & Oates; New York: Benziger Bros. 1900. Pp. 449. Price, $1.35.

THE BEAUTY OF CHRISTIAN DOGMA. Religious Meditations. By the Rev. Jules Souben. London: R. & T. Washbourne; New York: Benziger Bros. 1900. Pp. 246. Price, $1.35.

THE HISTORY OF THE HIGHER CRITICISM OF THE NEW TESTAMENT. Being the History of the Process whereby the Word of God has won the right to be understood. By Henry S. Nash, Prof. of New Testament Interpretation in the Ep. Theol. School at Cambridge. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1900. Pp. ix—192. Price, 75 cents.

INSTITUTIONES JURIS NATURALIS, seu Philosophiae Moralis Universae, secundum principia S. Thomae Aquinatis, ad usum scholarem, adornavit Theodorus Meyer, S.J. Pars II. Jus Naturae Speciale. (*Philosophia Lacensis.*) Cum approbatione Rev. Archiep. Friburgensis. St. Louis, Mo.; Freiburg. B. Herder. 1900. Pp. xvii—852. Pretium, $3.00.

THE THREE AGES OF PROGRESS. By Julius E. Devos, Rector of St. Michael's Church, Spalding, Neb. With preface by the Bishop of Ogdensburg. Milwaukee, Wis.: M. H. Wiltzius. 1899. Pp. xiv—352—xxxvi.

DAYS OF FIRST LOVE. By W. Chatterton Dix. London, S. E.: Barclay & Fry, Ltd., Southwark St. Price, 6d.

[1] Books sent for review should be addressed to the Editor, AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW, Overbrook, Pa.